

A
SURVEY OF CER
TAINE DIA LOGICAL

DISCOURSES, VVRITTEN BY IOHN

DEACON, AND IOHN WALKER,

concerning the doctrine of Possession
and Dispossession of Devils.

VVHEREIN IS MANIFESTED THE PALPA
BLE IGNORANCE AND DANGEROVS

errors of the *Discourfers*, and what according to pro-
portion of God his truth, every christian is
so bold in these poyntes.

Published by John Darrell minister of the gospel.



TITUS 1. 10. 11.

There are many disobedient and vaine talkers, and deceivers of
mindes, teaching thinges, which they ought not, for filthy lucre
sake, whose mouthes must be stopped.

IMPRINTED 1602.

RECEIVED

1864

1864

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

CHICAGO, ILL.

1864

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

TO THE READER, VVITH ANSVÈRE to the Discourfers two epistles.

It grieues me (Christian reader) I assure thee, still perforce to be thus troublesome not onely to my selfe, but also to thee. It must needs be enough, and more then enough for thee, to haue perused so many simple treatises already, all harpinge on one string. And as for my selfe, how can I after so great vexation by the B. of London, so long imprisonment, such publicke producement into open courts, & lastly my paynes to cleare the truth frō M. Harlins slaunders, but like a tired & weather beaten bird, wish sōe quiet corner to rest my selfe in, & to dry my feathers in the warme sunne? But it is not my lot, I thinke, to breath me, no not a little: For behold two new champions, that haue been bucklinge on their harnessse these two or three yeares, with a proud swelling volume like a Spanish Armada, challenge me afresh to a new encounter. Wherein yet this comforts me, that at this new on set is an open declaration to the world, that in these mens Iudgments at the least, the Bistop with his home forces hath bene to weak. Neither this onely, but even the B. himselfe by entertaininge this fresh ayde, doth as it were plainly confesse, his victory to be as yet imperfect. Other wise it were idle (yea for them to offer, or him to embrace a needles supply, if they perceived not their former platforms by that poore battery, which my continued writings haue made, to be tottering & falling. Blessed be God which though he suffer his truth to be sorely pressed, yet not to be altogether oppressed, to be sorely thrust at, yet not utterly cast downe: to be laden indeed with heauie loadens, yet to grow vnder them like a prevailling yalme. Gre at is the power I see of a iust cause, how simple so ever her tale be. But what? Shall the matter now be put out of all doubt? Must it needs in these Dialogues be convinced by Logike, and perswaded by Rhetorike, that all this bruite of Possession and Dispossession is but a mere deceit? O foolish and misadvised men, which thinke to overthrow that by sord Sophistical words, which by sad wordes and deedes hath not hether to beene vanquished. No cleare men of iudgment will herein deeme the Bistop to haue sailed in a great point of conscience, in committing the truth & execution of a battayle to these the weakest and cowardliest companies he hath. For if himselfe could not be satisfied to haue wounded the cause to his power, with the sword of his authority, but that he must needs race the memory of it with consuming fire, he should not for performance thereof haue sent in this Ignis fatuus, as every one may easily discerne this to be.

I pray thee Christian Reader, haue patience with me. I will stay thy paynes, and myne owne, as much as I can. My purpose is not to man out an other Galasse like this Discourfers gallant, but to set upon it with my

To the Reader

poore sylber boate, & yet I hope by God his assistance to make her lay her top
sayle in the broath. Neither thinke thou, I endeavour hereby a defence more
for my selfe, then for thee. I could haue contemned their frivolous reproches,
had it not bene thou wert greatly endangered by the manifold grosse errors
wherewith they would poison thee. And therefore intending thy good, more
then myne owne credit, I will take a breife view of their Dialogicall Dis
courses, before I come to them which properly concerne me.

These Discourses be fronted with a double epistle, one to the Right H.
the L. Keeper, and chiefe Iudges of the land, to which we will answer a-
none: the other to the Reader: wherein omitting their earnest care to find
out the truth in this doctrine, proceeding even to dissention betwene thes
two, otherwise sworne bretheren in matters of fact, first we haue a large re
hearsall of sundry reasons for the edition of this treatise, both wherfore it
hath bene hitherto suppressed, and also for what causes now at last it is
published. For suppressing the regard of your owne imperfections were
not to be misliked, if you had not repented of this humilitie so soone. But
I can hardly belueue you conceaued so meanely of your owne facultie, as to
feare the censure of any for scholasticall forme, your whole discourse is so
Analyticall, & your Philologus & Othodoxus such ripe & pregnant
concluders, besides your continuall vttering me with my Hotchpotch
and vs all which haue dealt in this cause with our intricate riddles. Nei
ther can I thinke you distrust your eloquence as you pretend, wherein you
brave it so every where. Whether it be Ciceronian vernish or no, I cannot
tell, my skill is not great. In my poore iudgement, to giue you your right, the
sentences are well fluffed with goodraiting wordes, able to still the babes
crying, & replenish chilhoodes with many Timely epithiues, sweetly buz
zing in every corner like a swarme of flies. I graunt you that there be many
busy controlers of other mens labours. But why should you feare a quippe
for a point of learning, which haue injured your faces not to blush at grea
ter matters? No doubt your compassion and care of me was great: least
by publishing this worke, you should increase my affliction, such is the cha
ritable regard you carry towards me in this you haue published, in every
page embracing me no lesse tenderly then the Ape her young ones. Lastly
you hoped, Authoritie might haue caused silence: for which purpose you
remember the obedience of the prophet to Amaziah his commaund,
after he had done his message, though not so fully as he would, yet sufficien
ly: such is your great skile, or at least your fidelitie in reasoning, that by
your rule, the hungry man must patiently fast, because he hath so which hath
his belly full. Will you would saue charge our straining in this cause,
with want of respect to her Maiesties Princely prerogative, but in an
were

TO THE READER.

measure also? Or are you only ignorant in this A B C, which every common Christian knoweth? I will not dispute this matter further with you for shame. Where as you say rightly, we have bene convinced for grosse malefactors, I shoulde marvelle at your imprudency, but that I knowe with what meits. I your forehead bespattered. If we were convicted for such as you say, what was the sentence of our condemnation? what was the punishment? what be came of the execution? As for our deprivation of the mynistry, was this an inflicted payne for teaching to counterfeite, wherewith M. More was neuer charged, and yet deprieved as wel as I: or rather the B b. only pleasure, who least they shoulde seeme to make all this stir for nothing, & not finding such cause as they desired, chose rather by laying this vpon vs to maintaine the reputation of their owne wisdom, then to punish vs for the desert of such a crime. If they had found our fault worthy thus to be censured, I hope they woulde not be so partiall, as to suffer all the rest of the practisiers, in the same ranke of guiltynesse with vs, eyther not to be called to account at all, or being excoynured to be dismissed againe without any correction. I wolde desire you (if any honest request may prevaile with men of your stamp,) that if you must needs be lying, you would be with more probability least all the world cry shame of you. Tenthly your Scorpions sting is ever wagging, in objecting disobedience to the Maiestrate, and printinge without pryvilege: you shall receive answer in your Queres where you urge this matter more importunately. And thus much for the wynde that moved the Aspen tree, of whose leaves it seemes, for all your reasons yet al leaded, your tongues are made.

The rest of the Epistle is spent in preventinge lawissh tongues, against whom you fence both your Persons, and your Cause. For your Persons, and first for your learning, It is say that men of your skyll can be so humble. Howsoever you in modesty deeme your selves Minimi Apostolorum, the least of ten thousand: yet for my part when I consider the multitude of good Authors prefixed before your Dialogues, and scattered sentences in them, & how little you are behoulding to any of them in the cheefest points you handle, having through the quicknes of your owne conceit found out that, which they never once dream'd of.

When I say, I consider these things, I am forced to yeild this praise unto you: that you are profound Reader, and digester, & men expert in Tablatures, which by the helpe of an Index are able in some few yeares to marshall a troope of sentences and Authors to some terrible shew. Besides who can but commend, as your multiplicity of reading, so your faithfulness in alleging, which would not use the phrase of Dare manus, but cite your Author M. Tullius Cicero for it: which phrase only, hath put Cicero in the list of Authors to make

TO THE READER.

make up the number: and the like diligence hath afforded vs the names of diuers others. Nay we thinke I see in you the skilful prudent Captaynes, which to terrify their enemies, can make an handfull of men shew like a great multitude, some one seeming two, yea sometimes three. This stratageme hath placed Aristotle in A, & Philosophus for the selfe same author in the letter P. So Iohannes Darrell being a great learned mā, first makes one in the ranke of 1, & the Narration of Darrell an other in the troopes of N. But Gregorius in G keepes a terrible styrr: for first he is put downe simply Gregorius, then againe Gregorius Magnus, and the thirde time Gregorius 1. Rom. and yet all these are but one. You must needs overcome, which are so full of pollicie, not inferior to Cytus, that by certain Idols made for the nose, and men of straw, sooke Cresus at Sardis. Feare not therefore ye learned Discoursers, howsoeuer the ignorant may lightly passe over your Table, painted margēt, & many authorities without due regard, yet the Iudiciall Reader (able to distinguish betweene a counterfeyt, & a grounded knowledg,) will giue you such commendation as you deserue.

For the carriage of your liues precedent & present, we haue a whole page perused with many slowly rearmes. And herein you lye about you mightie, bragging your selues like butchers maffines with their collers of iron pykes, & daring any to set vpon you. If your hornes peepe out of the bushes whether you are sled for covert, you may thanke your selues which haue eaten away the leauer. Yet I will passe by you, as though I sawe you not: not for any feare of your richins shyn, where-with you thinke you are sufficiently armed, but for that I thinke it better to passe by you in silence, then to reuer that which you deserue to beare, and to lay you open in your colours. I will only demaunde this of you, how you durst dedicate your treatise to the Right Honorable Lord Keeper, to the Lorde Chiefe Iustice of England, and other the chiefe Iudges of the Land, by this meanes to occasion them to enquire of your person? I say no more, let this suffice for answer of that Epistle of yours to their Honours, as I promised you. Yet I must needs tell you, that wher you say, we sport our selues in braiding our brethren, with the odious name of Formalists, you say verily. We accuse them For malists, which forme and fashion themselves like vnto this world: & not they which are crucified vnto the world, and the world vnto them, albeit in some things they differ from vs in opinion. And instcad of braidinge such with this or any other odious name: if they be of the appecient, we call and reuerence them as fathers: if others, we rearme and loue them as brethren. From these and the causes they speake of, it bringeth

and

TO THE READER.

selues injured elswhere. And yet strict course of law doth not allowe such
 your redresses, but rather inhibiteth it: commanding vs to stand to the
 judgement sentence of the Iudges. Now what else is a truth published in
 print without knowledge, but a supplication to the Prince and people for
 redress of her injuries: nay rather for redress of their own injuries, Thar is
truth
 which are endangered by allowance of trunperry to abandon truth, &
 to cast themselves into those manifold mischiefs which proceede from
 error. Good men and wise and most obedient to their gouernours, haue
 in all ages, and do at this day in all places of Christen-om, practise ac-
 cording to this rule, or else God his truth would be in pitifull case. Are
 not you then egregious Sycophants which doe vehemently condemne all the
 fault upon so slight a conceyt? Are not such as you a flattering poison
 to Princes, which would transforme them from gracious gouernours, into
 latefull Tyrants? Is it not amisse that such skilfull workmen, which
 can use a Bull for Phalaris, should say of their cunning first themselves
 what Tyrant when he hath done one iniury, will not suffer him so much
 as to grieve for his wrong? would you haue truth wounded, & not allow
 her to complaine? Indeed Tereus when he had deflowred thyloineia,
 cut out her tongue: and this earnestness of these Discourfers in this be-
 half giue shrewd suspicion, there is something in the words, wherefore it
 should be behoofull for them, that not only mens hands might be kept
 from printing, but also the mouthes of all that know them might be sure-
 ly locked vp, & that themselves might keepe the keyes.

The remainder of your Epistle shewes the order of the Discourse.
 Your Alphabeticall table, with the Seuerall names of the Seuerall Au-
 thors, and their Seuerall authorities we haue touched before. Yet further
 take this with you, that as Iehū caused the beads of the 70. sores of
 Ahab to be layd on two beapes in the gates of Iezrehel, so these names
 you produce be no bands offrends, ready to stand in your defence: but a
 shew how many you haue exprestly slaine in this cause, infinite
 others being also wounded in them. Your arguments wil saue me a la-
 bour: for I shall neede no other collection of your absurdities, (just so many
 in or first, your first dialogue excepted) as your arguments be. Your Ar-
 gument is harshly checkered one part within an other, like a motley cloke
 bag. For first you say, the diuel his power, is eather a power of pos-
 session or obsession: when possession & Obsession in such mens wi-
 tings as treat theis points are vsed for all one. Then Possession in your
 discourses you make only to be outward, and yet Mentall Possession
 must grow from it, as figes vpon thornes. If you say you mean possession
 vulgarly, neither is that true, for vulgarly it is applied to that vexation

TO THE READER.

which appeareth in the torture of the body. But your Mentall affliction is severally & solely by it selfe a Possession. The next division is either Reall, or Actuall. What have we now a Reall possession, wherein is no action? This indeede is a gentle possission. Again, Corporall possission is either by assuming true bodies, or transforming: whereby good angels shalbe made possessors & tormenters of men, as shall be shewed more in due place. You have presented vs heere therefore with an analyticall table, instead of a table: laboring to stop our mouthes with one gallimaufry served vp in diuers dishes, as if any two words vnder a pare of geminall lines were suffic. f. for such a purpose. For your Speakers in the Dialogues Philologus rattles prittily & answers his name well, but Physiologus might better be termed Philalogus, for he is but a Dunce in Philosophy, & your Orthodoxus is as rightly so called, as Iohn Deacon was sometimes A. VValker. Your Tables in the end might well have bene spared. I thinke he which hath once read your treatise, wil not be great & desirous to finde out any point to reade it againe. And thus at last we haue an end of the Epistle, to be comended cheeryly in this, that not onlie by the length it with-houldeth sometime the Reader from the treatise it selfe, but also by the fondnes might iustly bring him in dislaist with the rest, and so cause him to spare his paynes from proceeding any further, which perhaps he shall

perceave to be no

small be-

nefit.

I. D.

A SURVEY OF THE FIRST DIALOGUE

Though concerning those greate workes of God in freeing di-
uers from vexation of dyuels, at the hartye prayers of his people,
wherein *M. More* and my selfe haue ioyned with them, these Dyab-
logues containe stuffe little to the purpose, considering the question
is of matter of fact, whether any be freed from such vexation, or no,
and not of the manner, how such vexation is wrought; which is
hard for any mortall vnderstanding exactly to define: yet because Er-
rors in doctrine be exceeding dangerous, & of admyrable increase, e-
uery seede bringing forth a thousand: I haue thought it not amisse to
admonish thee Good Reader, in as breif manner as I can, what trum-
pery lyeth hid in each seuerall dialogue: and the rather for that they
were intended to disgrace that fact: which indeed they doe asmuch a
the rage of man vnto the mighty operations of God: that is,
they more increase the glory of it. For your first dialogue therefore,
It is true that there are diuells: that Diuells are no bare motions or
affections, but natures spirituall, substantiall, and of personall beinge:
which be called Angels: yet you speake dangerously when you say
there be *Essentiall Diuells as appeareth by their creation*, as if by creation
they had bene in a le such: you disclaime this wicked opynion after-
wards I confesse, and reason against it by some arguments: but euery
one reades not all: & it beehoues vs, least occasion of error be minist-
red to any, to vse wordes of soundnesse in euery place.

pag. 1.

Your *Magnitton* for Nottingham, *Eirwab* for Bawtrie & *Eibrad*
for *Da-bie*: seemes to be some pedlers french, such as vpright men
once practised when they ranged the country with their queanes: It
is small credit for you to be expert in this language.

M. Deacon
you now
what I
meane

For the substance of that which followeth in proving *Spirits to be*
subsisting natures: It is generally to be allowed and embraced. And it
had bene to be wished, you had kept the same moderation in the
rest that you could haue bene content to haue trodden in the stepps
of other godly & learned, as in this you haue in some sort done: ra-
ther then haue runne new courses: both hurtfull to others & perni-
cious to your selues.

A Survey of the Second Dialogue.

The second Dialogue dryueth to three cheif heads. The first treat-
inge of possession generally, & making it common to all afflictions
(by the diuel) tormenting, & tempting both inwardlie and outwardlie,
whereas the affliction of the minde is only called the trouble of consci-
ence, & Sathan his tempting of man, temptation or suggestion, but
neither of them termed by the name of possession any where. Thys
worde is proper to them, whose bodies be extraordinarily racked or
rent by Sathan, as the boy was *Marke. 9, 20*.

pag. 40

A SURVEY OF

De Idolord
vanitate.
in Mic 8:18
Cham Har-
mon, lib 3:
cap 37
pag 70
in Mic 1, 13
De opes ibus
creationis
pura 1. lib.
4. cap 10
in Mic 8:18
A. eclog 2.
pag 606
pag 126.

The e-istle
to the Rea-
der pag 1

pag 14, 40

pag 14, 1
Answer
pag 14.

Besides you distinguish betwene *possession* and *obsession*, contrary to the custome of all which deale in this argument. Ciprian saith, *Di-
wells aduersed by us, are compelled to goe out of the bodies obsessed.* And Dio-
nysius Carthusianus, In one obsessed, there was a legion of devils. Chemicus
treating of this argument, vseth ordinarily the worde *obsessi*. And in
like manner doe other both of auncient and latter time. Yea I dare be-
bould to say, that where once in this argument writers vie the wordes
possession, *possessiones*, *possidere*, they haue *obsessio*, *obsessus*, and *obsideren*
times. So that where you make *obsession* common to all men, in the world
in the language of the learned, All men should be Demoniacks: which
though your pallat be so grosse that you cannot discern how vnflauori-
it is, yet others can feele with their fingers to be most absurd. But
this was your ignorance, which eyther knew not, or did not well con-
sider what *Obsession* meaneth, as we shall shew more afterwards. And
therefore as becometh men of private opinion, you bring vs significanti-
ons forged in your owne mynt.

After you tell vs, that *possession* is nowhere any real inherency. In-
deede we know, Possession signifies to haue a thing in ones power by
any meanes how soeuer, as a man may possesse an horse, although he
be not in his belly. Neyther doe they which argue a *real inherency*
reason from the word *Possession*, as you fondly and childishly imagine,
but from other most plain reasons, of necessity importing somuch,
as shalbe declared in convenient place. If now *Possession* import no re-
all inherency, then you commit a double, notable folly: first that you
blame the English Translator for shuffling, this word into the text, when
by the whole world hath him vtterly possed, as you say, with many
grasse errors concerning the Diuel his supposed possession in man. I am
gladd our English translation is receaued vniuersally through the
whole world: for otherwise, I hope the whole worlde would not vni-
uersally be deceaued by it. But I pray, you, Sirs, (if your wyttes be
your owne.) if Possession carry no meaning, of inherency, what hurt
could the English translator doe, to the breeding of this opinion in
any, by vsing this word in the text? your fingers itched vntill you
were scratching this word in the English translation: How els should we haue
knowne you to be great linguists? Secondly, if possession signifie no
substantiall inbeing, to what end is your tedious discourse that the
word *Possession* is nowhere found in this argument, either in the old
nature or in the new. you would make vs beleue in your first dialogue
against me, it might probably be disputed, that til a little before the
coming of Christ there were no essential possessions, at all in Israel. In
Christ his time then it should seeme that there were essential posselli

THE 2. DIALOGVE.

3

ons. Thus vnawares you destroy that you build. But to let this goe. Would you then finde possession there descrybed, where was no vse of any such thinge? Surely you were sick of a superfluity of Hebrewes, and except you had *Timely* vented it in thys place, you had certainly dyed for it.

Where you say, No true Interpretour did ever translate *Demonizomenos*, men essentially possessed with diuels inherently in them, Indeed men visually are loath in translation to render so many words for one. But neyther say you is it so understood of the most iudiciall & soundest diuines. You might haue donne well to haue produced the authorities of some, and to haue spared your former ydle and vnauory flourish, with your greeke and hebrew. Calvin saith, *When Demoniacks doe speake the diuels speak in them, & by them.* Againe, It soloweth that the diuel hath an habitation in men, because he is thence driuen out of the sonne of God. Beza termeth the dispossession of diuels, *A casting of them out of the bodies of men.* Now then whether these wordes, I o haue dyuells speake in them and by them, the diuell to haue an habitation in men, to haue diuels cast out of the bodies of men, sounde rather a real inherency, or the contrary, Let any indifferēt man iudge. Peter Martyr speakes thus: *Christ & the Apostles commanded the diuels, that they should go out of the bodies possessed.* Piscator affirmeth, *that god sometime permitteth vncleane spirits to dwell in man.* He saith further: *The misery of the childe is set forth, by the inhabiting of the diuel.* And Zanchius proues this inherency by sundry reasons. It were long to alleadge all: and we shall haue more occasion afterwards. Therefore eyther shewe vs the words of the most iudiciall Diuines, by which it may either expressly appeare, or at least be soundly gathered, that there is no substantiall inbeing of diuels in Demoniacks, or els be ashamed to face out an vntruth thus impudently in the open view of the world.

The second generall poynt disputeth, whether it be necessary Satan should first enter essentially into the possessed mans mind, before he can possibly bring the body into his slavish subiection: which poynt you determine negatively, making to your selfe an aduersary of straw to fight withall, I neuer hauing affirmed any such thing. For my part I knowe the body may most violently be tormented by Satan, when the minde the meane while vpheld by the grace of god, doth not yealde vnto him. yet you proceede in this needeleffe businesse, and frame an obiection out of theis words, *And after the sopp Satan entred into him.* This entrance say you is only an effectfull thrusting of the intended treason into Iudas his heart. I will not dispute whether this entrance was substantiall, or no: (*Augustine* is of opinion it was not, but only a further degree of efficacy moving Iudas, whereto I consent) for this makes little

Pag. 18

in
Luc: 4: 33 a.
in

Math: 12: 43

in
Mat 12: 6.

Loc: comu
claus, 1: cap:
10. sect. 30:
math: 8, 23;
mar 9,

pag. 43

Iohn 13: 27

de consens
Evangel: lib
3: cap: 1

A SURVEY OF

to the matter in hand. *Iudas* is no where termed a *Demoniack*, of whom only our question is, neyther in truth may be counted one. For *Iudas* betrayed not his maister ignorantly, or vpon meere compulsion but through the voluntary mallice of his owne hart inflamed by the power of *Sathan*. So concerning *Ananias*, of whome it is said, *the diuel had fill d his heart*, I though this entrance were not reall, yet this cause is neuer the worse. considering the question is not, how the diuel doth enter by suggestion, but by possession, in which state *Ananias* was not. Therefore cease to encomber your Reader with vnnecessary talke, and either bring somthing to purpose, or houlde your peace. Next comes *Physiologus* in, and reasons very properly, but that he beates the anvil, not once striking the hot yron. The conclusion is, *The bodie may be in slavish subiection to Sathan, before the minde is self be subdued*: which if it be vnderstood of violent subiection, I haue already graunted: but *Physiologus* will needes also haue, it true in voluntary subiection, as if there could be a willing obedience without the commaund of the will. But what is his reason? *The bodie may be tempted externally, before the minde be subdued*. And this poynt because we doubted not of it, is proued by two whole pages. But what? Is all temptation before the minde be subdued a slavish subiection? Heere *Physiologus* is altogether mute: he spent all his goates wooll in makinge his other web, and hath not left himself one locke, to worke vp this peece with.

The third generall poynt is, *whether the diuel doth essentially enter into any mans mind*: which question I might well let passe, as little per teyning to this cause of ours. VVe only haue witnessed Gods greates goodnes towards certaine his servants in deliueringe them from the greuous rage of *Sathan*: but whether this vexation proceeded from his reall dwelling in the minde, or no, we haue not taken vppon vs to discusse. It was ynough for vs to behould the flame, and the Lord in mercy quenching it, although we be not priuy from what fornice yt arose. Yet becaule you haue propounded it, and that it is worthy consideration, (so we conteine our selues within the boundes of christian sobriety,) I will say somthinge in regarde both of the Reader, and my selfe, desyrous rather to learne, and to finde out the truth, then presuminge to conclude any thing peremptorily: *for what neede we, saith Augustine define any such thing with danger, whereof we may be ignorant without blame?* I answer therefore, the diuel doth not enter essentially into the minde, that reasonable faculty of the soule, which comprehendeth the vnderstanding and will. *The Lord only knoweth the hearts of al the children of men*. Neither yet doe I affirme that spirits doe really enter into the soules inferior powers and operations,

actes 5:3

Page 43

Page 45

Aug. enchir.
ad Laurent:
cap. 59

1 kings 8:39

THE 2. DIALOGVE.

3

as Quickning, Sense, Affection: only this I say, that after an hyden and vn'erable manner they doe apply and ioyne themselves to these her inferiour workes. *Gennadius* consentinge with *Bernard Augustine* & *Eeda* that the diuel doth not essentially enter into the minde, yet affirmeth that by an effectual application, and a violent oppression he is nerely vnited vnto it. VVhat els is this application, & neere vnion vnto the minde, but the ioyning of himselfe to the phantasy and affections, the next neighbors to the vnderstandinge & will? So *Bernard* requireth the entercourse of some instrument, whereby created Spirits might be applyed to the minde, that is, the Imaginations & affections, which be instrumentall, and by which they doe exceedingly worke vpon the highest powers in our nature.

And *Augustine* is most plaine avouchinge, that *Diuels* perswade by marueilous and inuisible meanes, by their subtilty peering into the bodies of men, not at all perceaving the, & mingling themselves with their cogitations by certain imaginarie sights, whether they be waking, or sleeping. But this is principally confirmed by the scriptures theselues, for that angels making their apparitions in sleepe, performe their operations immediatly. The outward senses at such time are all bound, so that by them they cannot conuey any thing from without, to the powers within. Example we haue in *Ioseph*, to whome an angell appeared in sleepe, bidding him not feare to take *Mary* his wife. And as this Angell did speake in *Ioseph*, so it might seeme the Angell which talked with *Zachary*, did speake in *Zachary*, as the naturall force of the word doth signify. And the Angell, saith he, which talked in me.

This vifion made to *Zachary* was in the night, for so he saith, I saw by night. And this manner of speech, to see by night, or to see night vifions, is all one to see a dreame. For so *Daniell* speaketh, I sawe, saith he, by night vifions, when as before he had declared it was by dreame, *Daniell* saw a dreame, and there were vifions in his head, hee lying vpon his bed. Therefore *Augustine* had good reason to dispute of this place of *Zachary* as he did, considering Night apparitions, the force of the originall word, and the greeke interpreters so care fully expressing it, notwithstanding whatsoeuer these men say to the contrary. Besides, experience also giueth no small light to this matter. It must needes be that wicked & horrible cogitations, such as make a man euen to tremble for feare, should eyther arise from the corruption of the flesh, or from some outward cause, or else from the reall presence of some wicked spirit mouing the phantasy. But the flesh is no author of such horreur, which by all meanes it escheweth affording rather all flattering and intising allurements to perswade the minde by: neither is there any outward cause or occasion, where

Bernard-Ser.
5. super Can
Aug. de SP,
et Anima
cap. 27
Eeda in Act
5. 3.
Gennad. in
definit. eccle
sie dogmat.
Bernard Ser:
5. Super can
tic.
Aug. de divi
nat. d. omni
cap. 5.

Math. 1, 20.
Zach. 11, 5 & 6
2. 3.
Zach. 1, 8

Dan. 7. 13
Dan. 7. 12

pag. 59.

by

by the thoughts should be so greuously assaulted, as is apparant in diuers so afflicted: It remayneth then they be stirred vp by the personall presence only of him, which if he be manfully withstood by faith will fly away. This I take to be the truth in this poynt: warranted both from the scriptures, and from consent of cheifest interpreters. If these things now be so, though you should demonstrate the diuell doth not enter really into the minde, yet if he be so nere the phantasie & other inferiour parts, he will be found to be within a mile of him whome he doth possesse, and you to haue powred forth a great company of big wordes to small purpose.

Iam: 9

pag. 46, 47,

Mat. 25: 34

Rom. 8: 36,

It I desired to shew, how when you haue a good cause you handle it full yll, I might fitly doe it heere. That *there is no mentall possession*, you proue thus, *The diuells, as also mans minde, are created of god for other more speciall ends*. As if things destined to some principall end, may not in meane season be vsed to other inferiour purposes. The elect are appointed to be heires of the kingdome, yet in this world they be as the sheepe of the slaughter. Indeece if you had shewed that god neuer purposed any such thing, you had laid somewhat. Againe say you, *The reall entrance into the spirits of men, doth obscure the peculiar office of the holy ghost, which is (repletingly) to inhabite in our hearts for ever*. If any sholde affirme such entrace he would not be so mad as to say, that spirits were there repletiuely. Seeing then there is no equality of their inbeing, (supposing such a thing) it doth no more obscure his office, then the light of a candle the cleare sun-shine. Further you say, *whereas there be three manners only of inhering essentially, none of all these doth agree to the inhering of wicked spirits*. I answer, (to admit this inherency for this present dispute) they be there definitiuely. Then, say you, *they are only there in conceits*. what say you? are diuells in the Aer but only in conceyt? are they any other waies there then definitiuely? This conceyt of yours makes diuells but a meere fancy. I thought you had ment good sooth in your first dialogue: but such counterbuffs as this would make one beleeeue, you are priuately of other iudgment, whatsoeuer there you pretend. Notwithstanding these and other such like reasons of yours, (which for breuity I omit) the diuel may possesse the soule of man, as well as his body. Such acute disputers are ye. It is no maruaile though you maintayne your bad cause as you doe, when you mannage a good no better.

A Survey of the third Dialogue.

The third Dialogue handles two conclusions: The first, *That spirits & diuells doe not enter essentially into the possessed mans bodie*. The second, *That they haue no true naturall bodics for this purpose*.

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

peculiar to themselves: importing a necessity of naturall bodies for a reall entrance: A thing most absurd.

That spirits doe enter really into mens bodies, we haue partly heard, but it is more euident by that which followeth. They present themselves to the phantasy without mediation of any outward sence: not by way of influence, themselves being absent, as the sunne abiding in the heauens pearceth with his beames to the earth: by personall presence therefore, which is required in their actions: For which cause they be *Angels*, that is, *Reporters*, sent forth to the ministerie, as the example of *Gabriell* sent to *Daniel* & *Mary* declare.

Againe they which dealt with familiar spirits, are tearmed by the 70. Interpretours *Engastrimythi*, that is, such as speake after an extraordinary manner out of their bellies: not as if they had a drum by their sides, but from a reall being of a spirit in them. For so it is said concerning them, If a man or a woman haue a spirit of diuination, or soothsayinge in them &c. Of whome *Theodoret* speaketh thus: Some by certaine diuells being swollen in thir bellies deceiued many of the simple, as first telling (forsooth) things to come, which the Grecians terme *Bowel-prophets*, for that the diuells seemed to speake from within them. Vnto whome *Aristophanes* alludeth. But imitating (saith he) the soothsayinge & wisdom of *Euricles*, by entring into other mens bellies, I haue poured forth many pritty comicall things. Vpon which wordes the *Scholiast* writeth thus. *This Euricles was a Belly-speaker, & was reported at Athens to haue prophesied many true things by a diuill that was within him.* Afterwards this manner of spirit was called *Pythion*, as *Th. Beza* witnesseth vpon the 16. Chapter of the *Actes* v.

16. where you may see more to this purpose. Besides, it is playne, that they which be possessed, are carried by an inward moouer, & not by a thing forcing them outwardlie. All outward violence, as if one be drawne, or thrust forward, hath a resistance in the bodie. but men possessed cut themselves with stones, cast themselves into the fier, & into the water, and runne to their owne destruction most greedely, as also the swine did hauing receaued these guests: w^{ch} erevpon the *Primitive Church* fitly called them *Enterprisers*, as hauing the verie reall fountaine of this operation within them. But chiefly it is to be remembred, that in the *Gospell* the diuill is said to (a) enter into men: to be (b) in them, to (c) dwell in them, and whe these men (whome we call *Demonstrables*) were healed, to (d) come or go out of them, to be (e) cast or throwne out, and to be (f) driuen out (g) Out of him (saith *Christ*) and enter no more into him. Then

Math. 12, 28.
Heb. 1, 14.

in *Leu*: 19,
21
Engastrimēni,
Aristoph.
in *utro*,

mar 3, 2, 12
& 9, 22.

(a) *Luk* 11,
16.

(b) *Act* 19,
16.

(c) *Mat* 12,
43.

(d) *Math* 12,
43 & 17, 20.

(e) *Lu* 11, 24.

(f) *Math*, 9,
22 & 10, 1

(g) *Marks* 3,
23.

(h) *Marks* 9,
25.

(i) *Marks* 9,
25.

(j) *Marks* 9,
25.

(k) *Marks* 9,
25.

(l) *Marks* 9,
25.

(m) *Marks* 9,
25.

(n) *Marks* 9,
25.

(o) *Marks* 9,
25.

(p) *Marks* 9,
25.

(q) *Marks* 9,
25.

the spirit came out. Againe (h) Hold thy peace, & come out of him: then the Diuel came out of him. and againe, (i) Come out of the man, thou vnclean spirit. Heerevpon the diuels besought Iesus, saying: If thou cast vs out, suffer vs &c. Then the vnclean spirit went out, & entered in to the swine. Where therefore the Discomfeyers say, there be no proper words or termes in any of the places of Scripture concerning Demonacks expressing an essentiall possession, the falshood thereof is so manifest, that it may be seene with ones forehead. For what words or termes can possibly be more proper, direct, & plaine, to expresse the inherency of spirits in Demonacks then these vsed by the holy ghost? It is written that after Christs resurrection many dead bodies arose, & came out of the graues, and appeared vnto many. Is it not heereby manifest, that those dead bodies had bene buried, and layd in graues? In the 10. of Luke we reade that the Samaritane hauing carried the man that was robbed betweene Ierusalem and Iericho to an Inne, tooke out (viz. of his purse) two pence and gaue them to the host, sayinge that whatsoeuer he should spend more, he would recompence. I woulde know now of M. Deacon and M. Walker, whether these two pence were not once in the Samaritans purse. And whether if they were neuer in his purse, it is possible he should take them out of his purse. In like sort S. Mark speaking of Mary Magdalen, saith, that out of her Iesus cast seauen diuels. And Luke that out of her went seauen diuells. I demaund now whether seauen diuels were not first in her, before they went out of her. This egress of the spirit (so often mentioned in the gospell) doth evidently proue the ingresse and inherency of the spirit. Yet the holy ghost resteth not heere, but doth in as plaine & expresse wordes affirme the ingresse, and the inherency of the spirit, as the egress thereof. The ingresse is set downe in these words, enter now into him. Also he cometh with seauen worse then himselfe, and they enter in. The inherency in the words following, and they dwell there. Likewise in that Demonacks are said, to haue a diuell. But cheifly and most plainly this appeareth by the 19. of the Acts where Luke mentioning the wounding of the seauen sonnes of Sceur, saith, And the man in whom the euill spirit was, ran on them, & ouercame them. These things must now needs be Riddle, except we will haue a man to enter into an houle, which comes no neerer then the doore: to dwell and be in it, and yet neuer come vnder the rooffe: and to be shewne out, though he was neuer within. If one should charge you M. Deacon that you were throwne out of Ireland, how would you defend your selfe, were it not sufficient to shewe you were

h) mat. 17. 23:
i) mat. 5. 18:
math. 8. 31:

pag. 3438

Mat. 27. 52:

Mark. 16. 9:
Luke. 8. 2:

Mark. 9. 33:
mat. 13. 44:
Luk. 4. 33: &c
8. 27. M.

act. 19. 12:
2. 12. 11

1. 17. 16:
1. 17. 16

1. 17. 16:
1. 17. 16

1. 17. 16:
1. 17. 16

were neuer in *Bolon*: So if the iugell could truly affirme he was neuer in any mans bodye, he would thinke he had no in all advantage against the Gospell, that proues him so oft to be *thorne out*. I beseech you let him be his owne Instructor, and doe not you helpe him with a fluff, whereby he might inueigle anie.

As this inherencie of spirits in *Demoniacks* is cleared by the holy scriptures, so hath the same in all ages bene receaued for a truth, as appeareth by the testimonies of learned writers here followinge.

Tertullian saith, It is not hard for the diuels to peirce into our bodies. Againe. We expell diuels out of men, as is knowne to many. These spirits saith *Cyprian*, disquiet our sleepe, and secretly also creeping into the bodies torify the minde, distort the members, &c. *Augustine* affirmeth, that the diuels are tormented, and cast out of the bodies of men possessed.

Againe, that through their subtilty they can peirce into the bodies of men when they perceane them not. *Theophilact* writeth thus: The Lord doth aske him his name, not that he himself but others should learne the multitude of diuels that were in him. Men know not saith *Aquinas*, when the diuel speaketh in them, what they speake. *Heer Martyr* reasoninge against the papists exorcising in baptisme, hath these wordes: Saye those Exorcists be not able to driue vncleane spirits out of them in w^{ch} it is not doubted but that they are: why babble they, that they cast them out of them, in whome they shew no signa of their presence? *Calvin* saith,

why a leg yon dwells in one man, is not for us to enquire. *Beza* thus: Not of euery ejection of diuell out of the bodies of men may this be affirmed which Christ here concludeth: seing by covenant *Sathan* may easily suffer himself to be cast forth of the bodies, that he might the more easily raige in the soules of men. Sometimes (saith *Chemnicus*) wicked spirits god permitting them, haue ingrediantur, doe enter into men, and doe so possesse them, that they dwell in them, abusinge their members as if their owne.

Daneus saith, fallinge higher to praye, but not to the man possessed, as though by the scarcity of victuals and want of meate, sin subuerten *Demonia* exallat, & should expell the diuel inherant in him. For diuels in *Demoniacks* are not fed with meate. Againe, the diuels in the bodies of men haue spoken. *Chrysostom* giueth this definition of possession, that it is an affliction of the body deliuered, with the power of *Sathan*, whome for sooth the body is not, and of *Sathan* inhabited, and the actions of the members gouerned not of the minde only, but partly also by the diuine spirit.

Againe saith he: As spirits be in a place definitiue, so a diuel, or more, occupy the body deliuered vp to their power: meaninge that they are definitiue in those bodies, that is, they be in them.

As *Chrysostom* saith, the diuels in the bodies of men haue spoken. *Chrysostom* giueth this definition of possession, that it is an affliction of the body deliuered, with the power of *Sathan*, whome for sooth the body is not, and of *Sathan* inhabited, and the actions of the members gouerned not of the minde only, but partly also by the diuine spirit.

Againe saith he: As spirits be in a place definitiue, so a diuel, or more, occupy the body deliuered vp to their power: meaninge that they are definitiue in those bodies, that is, they be in them.

As *Chrysostom* saith, the diuels in the bodies of men haue spoken. *Chrysostom* giueth this definition of possession, that it is an affliction of the body deliuered, with the power of *Sathan*, whome for sooth the body is not, and of *Sathan* inhabited, and the actions of the members gouerned not of the minde only, but partly also by the diuine spirit.

Againe saith he: As spirits be in a place definitiue, so a diuel, or more, occupy the body deliuered vp to their power: meaninge that they are definitiue in those bodies, that is, they be in them.

As *Chrysostom* saith, the diuels in the bodies of men haue spoken. *Chrysostom* giueth this definition of possession, that it is an affliction of the body deliuered, with the power of *Sathan*, whome for sooth the body is not, and of *Sathan* inhabited, and the actions of the members gouerned not of the minde only, but partly also by the diuine spirit.

Againe saith he: As spirits be in a place definitiue, so a diuel, or more, occupy the body deliuered vp to their power: meaninge that they are definitiue in those bodies, that is, they be in them.

Term in Apol, cap. 11
Cyprian: de Idolu-
mista-
te

Aug. lib. de ciuit. Dei 8.
in fine cap-
tis 16.

Avg. de d. i. d. d. m. cap. 1.
in Mar. 5. 7.
Th Aquin. 2. 2. q. 1. 6. 5. art. 2. arg. 4.

To comela
4. cap. 9. 1. 2. 16.

17 Mar. 5. 9.
in Mar. 13. 16

Chem. Har.
lib. 3. cap. 17.
pag. 70
in Ma. 9.
29. quist. 38.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

Don. de for-
tissis.
Chy. in Mach.
c. 12.

De operib.
cre. part 1
lib 4 cap 10

Angelograph
pag 606
what posses-
sion is,

so that they be not any where else. See further in Chytrius. Zanchi-
us hath these wordes. *Sathan doth so invade vs, vt in nistra etiam p-
mires et ingreditur corpora*, that he doth vnto & enter into our bodies,
and doth diuinely affect the same within. I see not why we should not say
substantia sua illos ingredi, that they doe in their substance enter into
them. And after some arguments to proue this, that they doe sub-
stantia sua manere in hominibus, in their substance or essence abide in
men: he concludeth thus. These things shew that diuels haue bene with
in in such kinde of men: and moued them hither and thither, as agents in
ternall, not externall. Piscator vpon these wordes Luke 8. 2. and cer-
taine women which he had healed of euill spirits, saith: *a hic n. at ad-
iunction inherens*. This preposition of, noteth here the adiunct inherēt.
VWhereby it is euident that he houldeth the inherency of spirits in de-
moniack. Ordo Casman maketh his entrance to his treatise of posses-
sion thus. There remayneth to be treated of, the entring of diuels into
the bodies of men & possession. He proceedeth. Possession is an action of
the diuel, wherein the diuel entring into the body of man doth possesse it,
and exercise vpon it the power receaued, to hurt and torment it. The par-
tes of possession be two: the ingresse of the spirit, the exercising of the pow-
er that is graunted. The ingresse is, whereby the diuel first entretch into the
body, and hauing entred doth possesse it. and is in it. And handlinge
this question how or after what manner diuels be in men: he resol-
ueth it thus: we say that they be in them indeed: even personally. For
further confirmation of this inherencie you haue *Centuria 1. lib. 2.
pag. 502. Socrat. 7. Cap. 8. Minutius in Octauio. Diomedius Carthagi-
nonis in Luc. 4. 35. et in Math. 8. 28. Scultetus in Medulla theolog.
patrū. pag. 55. Luthcr. in Math. 8. 28. Erasm. annot. in Act. Apoc.
19. 16. Gualther in Mar. 5. 1. Brentius in Mar. 5. 9. Bucer in Mat.
17. 21. Ph. Melancthon lib. Epistolarū. Bullinger: Decad. 5. Ser. 3.
Marlorat: in Marc. 5. 15. Musc. in Math. 12. 27. 43. D. Fulke his
answer to the Rbem. Test. Math. 17. 21.*

Answers
pag 17, 18
et 31.

Dialog. Dis-
cussio to
the Reader
pag. 1
et 12.

By the premisses, not only the falshood, but the blasphemy
of these men doth manifestly appeare: who feare not to call this
said doctrine of inherencie of Sathan in Demoniacks, an *absurd &
senselesse opinion*, and to reject it, as *fond and frivolous*. Hereby also
doth appeare their notorious impudency, in that notwithstandinge
the premisses (whereof they cannot be altogether ignorant, special-
ly if they haue ransae so many libraries as they affirme they haue)
they stick not to say, that if the severall writings of the most iudiciall &
soundest Divines be exactly considered, we shall finde, that not any one

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

ff

of them all doe vnderstand by Demoniacks, any such persons as are essentially possit with a vniuersality in them. Why I my self haue heretofore shewed the contrary, out of Tertullian, Ciprian, Chrysostome, Hieronimus, Philip Melancthon, Beza, Vogelius, and Llanens, as appeareth by the Doctrines. You might well therefore haue committed these wordes, vntill you had returned answer to those testimonies, and likewise haue reitrayned to say that the essential possession of devils is only a devise & dreame of my owne. But it may in no case be forgotten, that whiles you tell vs all sound Diuines are on your side, and not so much as one with vs, you produce not a sentence out of sound or vnsound Diuine: so as if we will beleue what you say, we must take it of your word: which no wise man will doe. Whereupon it cometh that ye are so barren heere in the allegations of fathers and new writers, who so abound therein else where: we may easily coequire. How Buter, Calvin, Nicolson, Guader & Beza, whome you coate in the margent as Diuines on your side, be not with you but against you, it is plaine by that is foresaid. Wherein we may be somewhat confirmed by their silence, but more by going to the places ye your selves haue quoted.

pag. 55. 56.
57. 58

Ans. pag. 33

prou. 14. 15.

Lastly, if devils haue no such inhering in the possessed, surely some writer of account considering the letter of the scripture is so plaine for it, and the generall mistake of all former ages, would in his exposition haue admonished the reader least he should stumble at these wordes in taking them literally. But I finde no such caution in any, that (searching) I haue seene, till M. Deacon and M. Walker now at sixteen hundred years haue timely put vs in minde thereof. Only Peter Lombard saith, It is not so perspicuous whether they enter really, or no. But this was his schoole fashion: to finde a knot in a bulrush. Yet hee doth not resolve of the matter. Put it may be these smart disputers haue found out that, wherein the skill and learning of all other haue failed. Let vs therefore weigh their reasons, when first we haue heard their answer to our foresaid main reason taken from the gospell.

Sent. lib. 4.
dist. 8. q. 4.

Whereas the letter of entering in, of dwelling, of casting out is vrged these men shift of these places thus, They are not to be construed according to the letter. Why so? Because the Lord saith, And I will enter in into him. And againe, and we will come into him & dwell with him: which are not to be understood of an essentiall entrance.

Reu. 3. 20.
Ioh. 14. 23

I answer, your bouldnes is exceeding great, who vpon so slender a foundation durst presume to depart from the euident wordes

of the scripture, so frequently vsed without any change. Because the Lord saith I will enter, a d yet doth not enter essentially, doth it therevpon follow, that also dwellers where it is said they doe enter, should not enter essentially? Is there the like reason of the infinite an d of finite spirits? God being every where cannot be saide to enter but figuratiuely, but in the creature, which entred by chaunging place, it is alwaies proper: except we can shew necessary reason to the contrary. By as good cōsequence you might proue that *Aaron* the high preist neuer entred into the tabernacle of the congregation essentially. The Lord commaunded the Israelites to make a tabernacle for him, that he might dwell amongst them. And *Dauid* will leaue the enclasting doors to lift up their heads, that the king of glory might enter in. But say you, the King of glory did neuer enter in essentially, and therefore where it is said that *Aaron* went into the tabernacle, it is by your readen rule, to be taken that he went not in corporally. Such foolery if it might be suffered wold make the scripture a nose of wax, if men might reiect the letter vpon euery such absurd fancy. It irkes me to spend time in reproouinge such dotage.

Exod 25:9,
plains 7:9

But you say, *Sathans entring into Iudas*, (Iob. 13. 27) which is the same manner of speech, as nothing else but that *Sathan* did dart or thrust the treason into his heart.

I reply as before. *Iudas* was not a *Demoniack*, and therefore this example suites not the purpose. It is not necessary the same speech in suggestion, and possession should import the same thing, it being proper to the one and figurative to the other. But if you can shew vs a possession which was effected by darting only cogitations into the heart, we will yeald vnto you that these wordes of *entering & dwelling* imply no real inhering. This is in effect that you say. These words, *entering into Iob. 13. 27.* are not to be vnderstood literally, therefore in the Scriptures concerning *Demoniacks*, the said wordes are not to be vnderstood literally. By this reason, *Christ* entred not into *Capernaum*, as it is said he did *Math. 8. 5.* Neither entred he in to a ship, as it is said *Math. 8. 13.* Neither entred *Mary* into the house of *Zacharias*, as it is written *Luk. 1. 40.* But some spiritual and mystical thing is in these places to be vnderstood by the words, *entred into*: for to make this an argument you must haue this for your proposition: These words *entering into* whersoever they be found in Scripture, are not to be construed according to the letter. Now this proposition I will be so bold as to deny, and put you to the prooue

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

39

proofe thereof in your next learned Discourse.

You goe on further in your answer thus; *Wherefore the Scriptures speake of the diuel his entring in, & going out of the parties possessed, they speake it only by Metaphore. And this you proue by Mark 1. 23. which place you shew at large cannot be taken in the li:erall sence.*

Answer page 15. and 17.

After this manner (indeed) you argue: *One place of Scripture concerning Demoniacks, viz. Mark 1. 23. can not be taken in the li:erall sence, but metaph:ricall: therefore no scripture concerning Demoniacks shall I instead of further reply proceede to reason after your manner?* Thus then will I reason. Diuers places of Scripture concerning Christ, can not be vnderstood literally, but metaph:rically: therefore none. Or thus, Christ is said to be a dore, a vine, *ergo*. Christ was not borne of a virgine, crucified &c. *He* was a * fox, therefore not a king. *Nero* a * lyon: therefore not a man. But supposig these wordes of *entring in*, and *going out*, wherefoeuer in holy scripture they haue relation to the diuel, were not to be vnderstood literally, are they therefore to be taken metaph:ricallie, as euery where you tell vs? No verily. There were a plaine metonymie of the effect, and not a metaphore. And considering you vie the worde effectually so of een, and that you say oft, that *this going out*, and *entring in* of the diuel, must be vnderstood of an effectuall and powerfull operation: me thinke if you were so great darkes, as you seeme to your selues, & to some poore soules in the world: you should one time or other haue be thought you of this error, which a scholler at the grainer scholl would quickly correct. If you will needes haue here a metaphore, I pray you let it hereafter be made to appcare, with his *protasis* and *apodosis*: that so we may conceaue this hidden metaphore. But *Orbis* of *xus* leueth not heere. And this I say further, (quoth he) that you can not possibly alleadge throughout the whole Scriptures, any one text, wherein either Angels or Spirits, or diuels are otherwise spoken of then only by metaphore. What? Is euery Scripture of this kinde metaph:ricall? why you your selues doe tell vs, that where in Luk. 4. 35. a man is said to haue a spirit of an vnclen diuel, that by spirit we must vnderstande the inuulsion, motion, or inspiration of the spirit. According to which sence, say you, the word spirit is vsually obserued both in the olde and new testament. And for confirmation thereof you alleadge Dan. 4. 5. 6. & 5. 11, 12. Rev. 16. 24. In these places then there is a metonymie, as euery boy can tell you, and not a metaphore. Againe, where *Sathan* is said to enter into *him*, that is, suggest or thrust

Answer page 17
How Marke 1. 23. is to be expounded, it is euident by comparing it with Luke 4. 35. & with Acts 19. 16. As all so by conferring Mark 5. 1. with Luke 8. 27.
John 10 & 13
Luke 11. 12.
1 Tim. 4. 17.

page 66

Ans. page 15

Answers page 20, 21

John 15. 19

thrust the intended treason into him, another text alledged & expounded by your selves with little or not that this is spoken metonymically, and not metaphorically. In the tilt of the *Actes* it is said of *channas*, that *satan filled his heart*. This filling, say you, in page 48, was effectually. Hence then likewise is a metonymy, well metonymie or metaphor, or whatsoever it is, this they are very lure of, that it is not possible to show any words of scripture, wherein that which is spoken of *Angels or devils*, is to be interpreted literally. Now what say you to *Heb. 4. 14*? where it is said, they are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for their sakes, which shall be heirs of salvation. And concerning devils, these places must needs be understood according to the letter. *Satan provoked dauid to number Israell*. The *devil bath bene a murderer from the beginning*, and *abide not in the truth*, because *there is no truth in him*. when he speaketh a lie, then speaketh he of his own, for he is a liar. The devils beleeve & tremble. All the devils be sought. *Iesus was 40. dayes tempted of the devil*. The devil saide, if thou be the sonne of god &c. The devil les him on a pinnacle of the temple. The *Angels* sinners are cast downe into hell, so be kept unto damnation. The *angels* kept not their first estate. They are reserved unto the judgement of the great day. Hereunto many more places might be added, but these suffice to shew that many things spoken of spirits are to be understood according to the very letter. And to argue without controversy in particular the places to be interpreted concerning the devils entering into Demoniacks, & going out of them: notwithstanding whatsoever their maine tanglers, which would be Doctors, &c. yet understand not what they speake, neither whereof they affirme) prattle to the contrary. Which tangling of theirs is very ealie, to be refuted, by the rules which a I mean deliver, when the scriptures are figuratively to be understood, and when not figuratively, but properly. Then namely are they to be understood figuratively, when the sense, which the very words taken according to the proper signification in founds, agreeth not with other scripture, and with the analogy of faith, but is rather repugnant to the holy scriptures. On the other side, properly, when it doth not repugne. Now to what testimonies of the scripture, is this entering in, and goinge out repugnant, being literally understood? what scripture is there that contrarieth this ingesse, inbuinge, and goinge out of the spirit we speake of? To the former rule let vs adde this other of *Augustine*. When any thing (saith he) is found in the Scripture, which cannot without an absurdity be possibly interpreted literally, that thing without doubt is spoken figuratively, & must receive some

1 Chro. 31. 1
Ioh. 8. 44,
James 1. 19,
mar. 5. 12,
Luc. 4,
2 Pet. 2. 4
1 Iude 6,

Zanchius de
verbis, lib. 1
pag. 66

Ad Gen. li
11, cap. 1.

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

Some other signification, then the 600 letter, does seeme to import, and otherwise according to the letter, for that is to be understood. But from this said literall interpretation, there can arise no absurdity, therefore not a figurative, but the literall interpretation is heere to be receaved.

But you proceede in your answer saying: that we must not so strictly tie our selves to the obseruation of words, else, how will we vnderstand this Scriptures 1st. the good spirit of the Lord departed from Saule. & an euil spirit of the Lord came vpon him. And so ye goe on troubling the second time about an equal manner of entring by the holy spirit, and the bad. If Saule was possessed with an euil spirit (say you) when the euil spirit of the Lord came vpon him, then also was he really possesst with the good spirit of god when he was anointed King, because it was so promised, That the spirit of the Lord should come vpon him.

I answer first, that Saule was no Demoniacke. Secondly, I haue sufficiently shewed your grossenes in attributing a like manner of entring to God the infinite spirit, and to the wicked angel a finite creature: The good spirit being every where, commeth vpon a man, by causing his graces more to appeare, and to sprout forth in him: the euil spirit being of a limited nature, and therefore absent from one place, wherbeit as in an other, comes vpon and into a man, not by influence and instigation properly, but by personall & reall presence. This considered, your hebrew is to no purpose. page 68, as also that, which you no lesse falsly then tediously, axouch in the next page, wherein you match the good and euil spirit together in a self same manner of entring into men. I thus much for replie to the answer you giue to the aforesaid maine argument proving a reall possession: Let vs now examine your reasons, whereby you goe about to ouerthrow the same, and to prove, that the euil did neuer reallie enter into, & inherently dwell in the possessed mans bodye.

First you say, That there be no proper wordes or termes in any of the places of Scripture concerning Demoniacke, expressing an essentiall possession: which the holy ghost wanted not, if he had euery purposed to expresse such a matter. For neither the hebrew word achuzzah, nor ierushah, nor ierushah, morashah, nor the grecke word ktema, which is ordinarily obserued in the new testament to set forth possession by, as the other be in the olde, are vsed in any of the places of Scripture concerning Demoniacke: therefore there be no proper wordes or termes in any of the places of scripture concerning Demoniacke expressing an essentiall possession.

Ans:

I deny the argument. For there may be, may there are other wordes and that very often vsed by the holy ghost, in those scriptures which concerne Demoniacks, that manifestly declare the *inberency of the spirit in Demoniacks*: which these wordes, signifying *possession*, nor any of the same significatiō doe not, had the fac bene vsed by the holy ghost. Doe I ady where, ye *Discoursters*, or yet any man else, goe about to proue the *inberency of spirits in Demoniacks*, from our *English translation*, and from the termes of *possession* and *possession*. Surely neither my selfe, nor yet any other of meane vnderstanding euer doted so much. For first I know very wel, that the word in the Original signifieth neither possession, nor possessed. Secondly, a'mit it did, it were very absurd from thence to conclude this *inbering of the spirit*. A man may be possessed of an house, though he be not in it. So might the diuell be posselt of a man, albeit he were not in him: if there were nothing else to proue the *inbering of Satban in men posselt*. Whereby the vanity of this *Prosyllogisme* doth notably appeare: and that these men keepe much adoe about mooneshine in the water: Their leaues consumed about the termes of *possession* and *possession*, seruing to no other purpose, but to proclayme their great skill (forsooth) in the hebrew & greek tongues. As for our English translators, they in translating the word *Demonizomenoi*, in latin *Demoniaci*, *possession* with diuels, did not respect so much the propriety of the word, as the condition of *Demoniacks*, and to explaine that word, by shewing (in parte) what a *Demoniacke* is. And from hence it is that the words *possession* and *possessed* haue bene vsed by *Cyprian*, *Cheyssosome*, *Augustine*, and generally all auncient and latter writers vntill this day. Not to note the *inbering of the spirits in Demoniacks*, (which neede not) as theis Ianglers fondlie pretend, but to shew that the diuel houldeth in his dominion or power the bodies of *Demoniacks*, as a man doth that which he posselteth.

Cyprian Do
mitistract. 1.
Chrysostom
Tom. 5 de in
compre. Dei
nat. hom. 4.
Aug. lib. 8
de Ciuit. Dei
cap. 26

From this argument they proceede further to argue against reall possession vnder certaine foolish and vnlearned questions: & *Orthodoxus* being out of breath, *Phisalus* starts vp in his place, and proues it by good senslesse reason. Doe you imagine (saith he) that the Lord euer propounded any such ende to himselfe in the creation of bodies?

Arg. 3.
page. 701
75. 76. and
341.
answ.

Thus might one reaſo against that saving of the *Apostle 1. Cor. 6. 15*. Also against the torment the bodies of the damned shall endure in hell. Doe you imagine, the Lord euer propounded to himselfe any such

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

27

such end in the creation of bodies? They will answer, the Lord did not propound any such end, but man brought them vpon him by sinne. Euen so doe I. Man by his sinne bringeth (sometimes) that body of his to be a receptacle and habitation for the vncleane spirit, which otherwise should be the habitation of God, and temple for the holy ghost to dwell in.

But goe is, (saith he) What becomes of the soule, all the while the diuel is in the body? Remaines the soule stil in that body, or is it vnterly expelled, & thrust out of the same?

Arg. 3.
Pag 70.

It remaines still in the body. In a sound the soule is in the body, though it doe not shew it selfe in her animall and organically operations. Euen so in this case, the soule is in the Demoniacke body, though in his fits, not his spirit, but the vncleane spirit, shew it selfe by the effects.

Answer

This naturalist goeth on thus. If there be a reall possession, then the soule during the time of the possession, shall not be accountable for any those peculiar actions of the bodie, which it neuer directed the bodie vnto, nor gave consent vnto.

Arg. 4.
Pag 73, 74 &
141.

This is cunninglie done of you, that in the last iudgment you can diuide the bodie & the soule asunder, that each may giue account for their severall actions apart. Secondly, your proposition is very childish. VVhat if the diuel force the tongue to blasphemy? what if he abuse the other members to all villany? Shall not the creature which hath bene deseruedly yealded vp into the power of the aduersary, be guiltie that it hath bene an abused instrument to the creators dishonour? We may remember heere, that the diuels instrument in deceauing Eua, receaued therefore punishment from the Lord. If you had weighed these thinges, you had bridleed your selues from much idle talks.

Ans.

Om: 14.

Their fyft argument followeth. The diuel needeth no reall possession in any mans bodie, therefore he doth not really possesse any mans bodie.

Arg. 5
Pag. 75

I answer your frivolous argument with the like. The diuell needeth none of your small possession, therefore he neuer possessed any actually, which you say sometimes he did. The diuel needeth not to tempt men: therefore he doth not tempt any.

Answer

But you say, The diuell neuer receaued larger commission ag ainst any mans bodie, then ag ainst Iob. Or yet was not he essentially possessed, therefore there was neuer any possessed essentially

Arg. 6
Pag. 75

This argument halteth on the right leg, and is like to this:

Ans.

Lab

Iob had not (that we read) the palsy, the stone, the collick, therefore alse, are no such diseases. If you will haue this an argument, let this be your proposition, and hereafter prooue it All the diseases & infirmities the body of man is sub. Et 7. 10 by Sathan, the he had Iob.

Iob. 1. 6.

The killings
of him excepted,
which he was ex-
pressly for
bid to doe.
Mat. 4. 5. 8

God permitted the diuel to afflict *Iob* in his bodie, which before he had ocn)ea him: doth it therevpon follow, that he might doe to the body of *Iob* what he would? To the diuel great power likewise was graunted ouer the blessed bodie of our Saviour. He tooke & carried it (in the ayre) out of the wilderness vnto *Ierusalem*, and sett it on a pynacle of the temple; and from thence he had it to an exceeding high mountaine. Had Sathan because of this leaue and permission, absolute and full power ouer *Christ* & *Iobs* bodies, & not a limited power? Again, were this so, yet it may well be that though the diuel could, yet he would not enter into *Iob*. Because the marke the diuell aymed at, was to draw *Iob* from his feare of God, and eschewing of euill, to the committing of euill, and blaspheminge of God to his face: wherevnto possession serued not so much, as other kinde of afflictions.

Iob. 2. 1. 5

Arg. 7.
Pg. 76,

Physiologus goes on, and powres out other arguments of like liquor. What possession (saith he.) the diuell hath in any, the same hath be in all the posterity of *Adam*, yea in *Adam* himselfe. This proposition it were fit the Masters of *Bedlam* might resolue you in. Yet go on, what then? But there is no reall possession in all the posterity of *Adam*. Though I wil not strue with you in this point, but willingly yeilde it. Yet the reason you tender of it is verie silly, to wit, for that the image of God is yet essentially in man. As if the Lord could not & doth not preserue that little rubbish of his image left in his creature though he suffer Sathan to enter really into it. The Diuel entred in to paradise before mans transgression: yea the aer carries a stampe of Gods wisdom and power; yet the diuel hath an essentiall being in it. But to come to the argument it selfe. *Adam* was not essentially possesst, and with him all his posterity: therefore there is no essentiall possession. Such an argument for all the world is this. All men haue not the gout, therefore none haue the gout. I maruaile how *Physiologus* could make it without the help of *Orthodoxus*. Although this argument deserue rather to be baffled at, then answered, yet I retourne that the consequence is faultie. It followeth not that none of *Adams* posterity be really possesst, if all be not: because *Adam* and euery one of his posterity are not by the appointment of god, to tast of euery in firmity that they by their finnes haue brought themselves in daun-

Answer,

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

19

ger of, and made themſelues ſubieſt vnto. *Adam* and euery ſonne of his are ſubieſt to the leproſie, pally, ſtone, gowt &c. yet is not euery one a leper, euery one hath not the pallie, ſtone, &c.

But goe to *Phyſialogus*, open your packe to the bottome. Then take this with you. *If an humane bodie be capable onely of an humane ſoule, then is it vncapable of an eſſentiall diuel: but the firſt is true: therefore alſo the latter.*

Arg. 8.
Pag. 77.

If this propoſition of yours *Phyſialogus* be vndoubtedlie true, as you doe tell vs: I marvel how you & *Orthodoxus* doe liue: & whether you two breath & draw aire, whether alſo you receiue any ſuſtenance. For if you breath, or receiue ſuſteinance into your bodies, then ſeeing aer, meat, drinke, be not an humane ſoule, but other ſubſtances: either you two haue no humane ſoules, or your two bodies be capable of other ſubſtances beſides your ſoules.

Anſ.

You proceede, *Sathan ſo poſſeſſeth, as Chriſt innadeth his houſe*, that is, diſpoſſeſſeth him of his houſe, for ſo appeareth your meaning to be. This you ſay indeede, but proue it not. Againe *Phyſialogus* will make it good by a diſtribution of inbeing: of all the kindes whereof he ſees not which may be giuen to this reall poſſeſſion.

Arg. 9.
Anſ.
Arg. 10.
Pag. 78:

I anſwer, The wicked ſpirit is in the bodie, as in a definitiue place. What now *Phyſialogus*? Are you ſtruck dead with this anſwer, that you haue not one worde to ſay? Take hould then of an other argument if you can goe no further in this. Thus then you reaſon. *If the diuel be really in the bodie, he is there either hypſtatically, making one perſon with the bodie, or elſe eſſentially, to giue an eſſentiall forme to the intended operations. But he is in the body neither of thoſe wayes. I graunt it, and yet you neuer a whit the nearer: I cannot but maruaile at your propoſition, which though it be lame, is yet of admirable force. It is able to proue that the diuel is no where. For wher ſoeuer he is, he is there either hypſtatically, or formally, but he is in no place either of both waies, and ſo no where. Nay your ſelues ſelues may be proued not to be in your houſes, nor in any other place, becauſe you make not one hypſtaſis with it, nor giue vnto it an eſſentiall forme. Make much of this propoſition, as of a rare iewel. It is as good as *Gyges* his ring, by which you may goe inuiſible: which faculty would ſerue you eſpecially *M. Deacon* for many ſtrange ſeates.*

Answer:

Arg. 11.
Si dicimus
os reuera,
(ſay they) in
the mar-
gine) atque a
deo, autopro-
ſopos ad eſſe
et in eſſe: eſ-
ſet hoc, vel
hypſtaticè,
vel formaliter,
quod eſt
abſurdum
Anſ:

In the twelue place they argue thus. *If diuels haue an eſſentiall being in men, then their ſaid being there may be perceaued by corporall ſence: but the latter is falſe, therefore the firſt.*

Arg. 12.
pag 78: and
97.

Answer 1.
Plin. 34. 11

By this reason *the Angels of the Lord pitch not their tents about them that seare him*, neither doe they minister to the heires of saluatiō: for this cannot be perceaued by corporall sence. There be many things which we know and perceauē only by faith. Secondly, the assumption or second part of the argument I denie: & affirme; that we may know by corporall sence, when the diuel is really and substantially inherent within man, euen by the supernaturall effects & operations which Sathan in such case vseth to send forth: which as signes doe signifie and declare this inherencie. Now these signes or effects are by corporall sence discerned. That which in the generall we know and perceauē by faith, that in the particular, touchinge this or that person, we know by sence.

Argu. 13.
pag 79.

Their last argument is this, *The diuels without venting & tearing with other the vnnaturall actions, may effectually be wrought in the man possessed, though the diuel neuer essentially enter into his bodie: this entrance therefore to such purpose is needlesse, and so by consequēce there is none.*

Answe.

The Antecedent or first part of this argumēt is false, as I haue shewed in my Navigation page 21. But supposing it were true, we must know that it is a iudgment, or an increase of this said iudgment, when besides the vexation of Sathan, our bodies shalbe a receptacle and place of aboad for the vncleane spirit to dwel in, which were made to be a temple for the holy ghost. And in this respect (were the antecedent true) there is sufficient to moue the Lord to permit Sathan to enter into the bodie, and Sathan to desire this entrance. And thus much for your first conclusion, no lesse absurdly handled by you, then propounded. Herein I haue bene the larger, because it is the maine poynt controuerted: and as it were the foundation or corner stone, whereon our whole buildinge doth stande.

Your second assertion is, *That Diuels haue no true naturall bodies peculiar to themselves*: which makes as much for his not beinge really in mens bodies, as it doth for his not being really in the Aer. But I will not follow you at euery turne, least I shoulde too much distrust the Readers iudgment: Besides I am more then half wearie already with your sence-lesse disputes. Many famously learned in the Church both of auncient time, and this present, attribute a kinde of bodie to Spirits, not grosse and palpable, as theis inferior bodies be, but of an incomprehensible subtilty: of which number are Tertullian, Augustine, Bernard, the Schoole-men, Zanchius with many

THE 4. DIALOGVE.

21

many others. These *Discourfers* take vpon them first to refell the arguments which make for bodies, & then propound some of their owne against them. In refelling Celestiall bodies they shew themselves turne-sick. Euery thing wheles so about with them, that they know not where they are. If *diuels* (say they) haue celestiaall bodies and enter into men whose bodies are Elementarie, then we should haue a compound supernaturall motion both in respect of the *diuels*, whose proper motion should be Circular, & of the man whose motion is down right. As if intelligible natures had a simple, and not a compound motion. But it were tedious to vnfold all the fooleries of this argument. I will therefore passe ouer this, and the rest of their wise refutation, and come to their owne confirmation of it. How doe you prooue *Spirits haue no bodies*? First out of these wordes, *Spirits and diuels haue no flesh or bones, as you see me haue*. This place proues no more but that they haue not naturally palpable & solide bodies like mens. For otherwise you might conclude the Aer to be also voyd of body, because it hath no flesh & bones. Again say you: *The Lord hath made his Spirits his messengers, & his ministers a flame of fyre*. From hence you must conclude thus, They which be as fyre haue no bodies: which is true if fyre it selfe haue no body: you see then how wisely you reason. Thirdly, which hath most force in it, and for which cause I take this paynes to repeat these reasons, *They which can be in the body of a man to the number of a Legion, that is six thousand six hundred, sixty & six cannot possibly be any corporall substances*: But the *diuels* may be in the body of a man to the number of a Legion, that is 6666. & therefore they cannot possibly be any corporall substances. To let passe the proposition, though the moates in the sunne beames be bodely things, and yet it may be as many as a Legion in as narrow roome as a mans body: did you dreame you *Discourfers*, when you put downe this assumption? Or hath the truth wrunge from you a true confession whether you would or no? By this one argument, all the first part of this Dialogue, wherein you oppugne the reall inherency of *Spirits* in possided bodies is ouerthrowne. It can not be but lyars should be taken tripping at one time or other. Now then if you please, we wil proceede to your fourth Dialogue.

pag 81:

pag 94
Luke 24:39.

Hebrew 1:7:

Mathe 5:9.

A Survey of the Fourth Dialogue

In the fourth Dialogue you contend, That *Diuels cannot assue* pag: 101:
bodies vnto them. Where first it is to be obserued that this disputa-
tion

tion springes from the former, as the special from the generall. For *bodily possession*, say you, is *either by assuming of a bodie, or by transformation*. Whereby it must needs be, that all assuming of bodies, is bodily possession: but onely good Angels (according to the diuinitie of this dialogue) assume true bodies, and therefore they onely possesse: & so be the only tormenters of the possessed. Yet our Saviour in freeing men from such molestours, doth vsually tearme them vncleane spirits. Such is the dotage which vnawares you run into, whilst with more confidence then with either wit or learning, you maintaine these absurd positions. Againe, this distribution of *bodily possession*, into *assumption of bodies, or transformation*, would tye all bodily possession to one of these two, (for the generall must of force be comprehended in all the specials) whereas corporall possession requireth neither of both, the spirits in their owne substance, without taking any forraigne body, entring into such as be permitted ynto them. But so you be talkinge you care not greatly what you say, be it neuer so absurd.

In Math. 4.
ver: 3, 5, 8,
Angelogra.
page, 556.

August: super
Gen 11

Aquinas 2, 2
q. 165, art. 2
Arg. 4: Mer-
cer: in Gene.

31:
Bulling. De-
cad. 4: ser. 11
Calvin in
Gen: 3,

Dane: flag:
part 2, cap:

34.
Hunnius dis-
put. 4 propo-
14, 15.

Zanch. de o-
peribus cre.
part. 1 liii. 4,
cap. 10:

Szeged, in
com. pag.

400
P: Martyr 10
com. claff. 1,

sect. 15. et
cap. 10, sec.

25,

To proue the affirmatiue parte, I meane, That *Diuels can put* *upon them bootyes*, that so they may visibly appeare vnto men, & familiarly converse with them, I will not vse many wordes, nor authorities, sith the matter is so euident by daylie experience.

Piscator saith to this purpose thus. *It must not seeme incredible, that the diuel having taken upon him the shape of man, should come vnto men & haue speech with them. For that we see he did when he tempted Christ.*

Neither must this seeme lesse credible of euill angels, then of good, by whom it is certaine this was often done: as the examples in Scripture doe testify. Orbo Casman a late approoued writer (who is very often quoted by these men, they thereby pretending that he consenteth with them, when he is as contrary to them, as light is to darknes) saith

after this manner: *It is so certaine that the diuels assume and moue diuers kindes of bodies, diuersly formed, that it cannot be denyed.* I omit heere to produce the testimonies of other learned writers, as

(¶) *Augustine, Tb. Aquinas, Mercer, Bullinger, Calvin, Daneus, Hunnius, Zanchius, Szegedinus*, with sundry others. Only I will adde a few lynes out of *Peter Martyr* that great learned man, that it

may the better appeare vnto vs, that this is both possible and easie, and that this said *assuming* may the better be conceaued and vnder

stood of the vnlearned, *The diuels* (saith he) *can in very deepe enter into a body made before, and formerly existing.* (meaning into created or true naturall bodies) Sometimes the diuell putteth on an acry

bodie:

THE 4. DIALOGVE.

23

body: but that he doth not forme or quicken as the soule doth our body: neither doth he make it to passe into one substance with himselfe, as did the word of god with an humane bodie: for diuels can put of those bodies, when they please. The diuel, as saith Augustine, sitteth vnto himselfe some body as it were a garment. Againe, These bodies which the spirits doe apply vnto themselves, be aery: for euen as water is congealed into ice, and sometime hardeneth til it become christall, euen so the aer where-with spirits doe cloath themselves, is thickned, so that it becommeth a visible body. But if it may seeme that the aer alone is not sufficient, they can also mingle some vapor or water withall, whereof colours may be made, for thus we see to be done in the raynbow. The spirits doe thicken & engrosse these bodies, by straight trussing those partes together for otherwise they might not be scene or touched. And yet we say not heere, that the diuell doth either create or make such things, but only that he is a minister seruing vnto nature. Euen so the husbandman, when he tilleth and soweth his ground, & the gardiner when he pruneth and delueth a vyne, doe not create the corne or wine, but only doe helpe nature. So Augustine saith, that Iacob did not bring forth the colour vpon the sheepe, but did only rightly apply the formes & shapes. But as seaweth wonderfull how they can so speedely bring these things to passe. A skilfull artificer will worke any thing both handsomely & speedely. But giue the same instruments vnto an ignorant and unskilfull man, and he will doe it neither re dely, nor yet very handsomely. Euen so any spirit, as a skilfull artificer will bring more to passe in a mynute, then by the accustomed order of nature can be wrought in a long time. Thus far goeth Peter Martyr.

The generall consent of writers as it should seeme, did wring from you this modesty, that you would undertake no absolute de-
~~gall~~ heretof, but only make a question of it. As if it were a small matter
 to make Questions of things substantially true in themselves,
 and vniuersally receaued. VVould you haue Christians be-
 come Academicks? or hath not the world had inough of Peter Lum-
 bards diuinity? It seemes you haue little regard of troublinge the
 Church. I wish they may haue more which haue the allowance of
 such bookes to the presse, yet seeing such lauish Discourses must coe
 abroad, least any should be deceaued by your vaine glose, I wil pro-
 ceede to examine your doing. The argument vpon which you
 ground, is after this manner. If the Diuel assume to himselfe a body,
 it is either a true body, or a phantasticall body, one created some time be-
 fore, or then newly, either the bodye of a liuinge man, or of a dead man:
 But none of all these, & therefore no body. I answer first, that he assu-

ibidem
 sect. 24

sect. 15

pag. 100.

pag 100. 108
 101, 103: 62
 104, 105.

E. I.

meth

meth both a true body, and a phantastickall body: sometimes the one, and sometimes the other. Secondly that he taketh a created body. If you demand by whome? I answer by himself. You reply, that creation is proper to God alone: and I reioyne, that creations is twofould. One when a thing is made of nothing, as all things were in the first begininge, in which power no creature may challenge any part: the other when bodies are framed of some matter al ready bein g: In this kinde the Lord doth vse the ministry of his Angels. If it seeme hard to giue the name of creation to this latter kinde: then I answer, that the body the diuel vsually assumeth, is an vncreated body. The matter of his body is from god & from his creation, it being made of aer thickned or of some such like matter. But the (¶) forme & in that it is a body, hauing the bignesle, proportion, colour, voyce & motion of a body, is meeresly from the diuel. Here by I say it is plaine, that it is an vncreated body * formed by the diuel, but not created by him. For then he should make it of nothing. Neither is it created by god, the alone creator: because it hath not the * forme, nor that it is a body from him. And yet notwithstanding it is a thing existing in nature, before the diuel assume it, as euery childe may perceaue. And that this spirits be able to performe we cannot but acknowledge, except we suppose them to be of weaker strength then other creatures. Doth not the sunne by his heate frame in the dunghill the body of a mouse, and giue vnto it also life and sence? Philosophie and experyence doth teach thus much. It were absurde to imagine Angelicall natures to be of lesse ability then the sunne, especially in a matter of lesse difficulty by somuch, as it is more easy to frame & assume a body one lye, then to quicken and endue it with sensible forme. And why should it not be as possible and easie for the diuel thus to compact and frame a body, for height, length, breadth, with all the partes & due proportions thereof of any kinde whatsoeuer, like to man, dog, catt, toade, &c. & enter into it, as to cause a tempest, & those other accidents whereof we reade in the history of Iob? Thirdly I answer that in apparitions, which are not properly called possessions, he neither taketh a liuing mans body, nor a dead mans, but only such a one as is made specially for that purpose, which when the errand is done, is dissolued into the same nature it was of before. And whereas you tell vs concerning the dead mans bodie, that if the diuell should assume the carkas of a man lately deceased, he should appeare in a white winding sheete: I see no reason of this windinge sheete, except it

as 7 does not
means that
the diuell
doth forme
or quicken
an airie bo-
die, as the
soule doth
our body:
but that frō
him it hath
the forme, fa-
shion, and
shape of a bo-
die.

Iob. 1.

THE 4. DIALOGVE.

47

cept it be for you *M. Deacon*, to doe your penance in. But you adde, mens bodies were created for the Lord, & not for infernal spirits. True, page. 108
To this end mans body was not created. But heerevnto hath man made his body subiect by his owne transgression. You say further. If the diuel can assume to him self a dead body, then we must needs imagine a resurrection of bodies before the generall iudgment, and that performed by the diuel, whereas that power is proper to god. This proposition is false. In the resurrection the soule and body shall be vnited together, and by this coniunction the body againe quickned. Now this can only Iehouah doe. And after this manner many dead bodies arose and came out of the graues, & appeared to many at the resurrection of Christ. But heere is no such coniunction: neither doth the spirit assuming, quicken the body assumed. The diuel is too weake to performe either of those. So that for any thing you say, he may take liuing or dead bodie, which he please. Thus we see there is no truth nor soundnes in this argument, but a meere trifling & abusing of the Reader, as wel concluding that neither good angels can possibly take bodies vpon them (contrary to the expresse truth in the scripture) as that the wicked cannot. VVhich kinde of affirmations would rather be confuted by good sound correction, then by disputation of any man of learning, though as meane as my selfe: And this is all the wise prooffe you bringe. The rest of the dialogue is spent in refelling the reasons for the contrary, which be chiefly five.

Math. 27. 46

The first, *Good Angels haue appeared in assumed bodies, and there fore wicked Angels may doe likewise.*

This argument you would shift of by diuers foolish vntruths, first, for that it consisteth not of things essentially alike in euery respect. VVhy Sirs? Haue you found out a difference in the essence of good and wicked Angels? All sound deuines hitherto haue made their difference onely in their quality. But you are nothing dainty of such nouelties. W'el to let this passe: How shew you there is a diuers reason of them in this poynt? In this sort: *The priuiledge of celestiall Angels, is not incident to the infernall.* To graunt you this, what doe you build from hence? But to assume a body is the priuiledge of celestiall angels. This is a second vntruth. You were ashamed it may be, to expresse it plainly (I would be glad to heare you were growne so bashfull) but it must necessarily be vnderstood. If to assume bodies were the celestiall angels priuiledge, the Lord which is the maintainer of this priuiledges, would neuer haue suffered Sathan to haue

pag. 108
Zanch. de op
poribus redi
part. 1 lib. 46
cap. 100
Piscator in
Math. 4. 1

entred

entred into the body of the serpent. You are to vnderstand therefore, that this *assuming* is not done or permitted by god for the benefit of the spirits, but for the comfort or discomfort of man. You add, *Neither yet are they equall with the celestiall Angels in knowledge and power.* It is ynough if the euill angels haue knowledge and power to compact and frame a body of the ayre and such like matter, &c as a garment to put it on. And this knowledge and power they haue.

pag. 106.

Fourthly, say you, *the bodies wherein good Angels appeared, were not created by themselves, but by god.* I answer, if they were such as were immediatly made of nothing, the Lord was the only workman of them; but if of some forebeinge matter, their ministry might haue a place. But admit they were immediatly made, may not the Lord also create bodies for wicked spirits to vse in their speciall seruices? You imply *he will not.* It is presumption to search further into God his will, then his word and actions doe warrant vs; and, it is blindness not to acknowledg so much, as they leade vs vnto. Seeing then the Lord in iust iudgment permitteth Sathan to be a lying spirit in the mouthes of all *aduersary* prophets, and to come in all deuiliablenes by Antichrist to beguile the reprobate; is it any thing contrary to his holy iustice and will to allow him such means, whereby he may accomplish the vengeance determined. Euen so in this case.

2 Thess. 2. 9.

Fifthly you say, *that howsoever good Angels haue appeared, yet of euill Angels no example can be giuen.*

The examples be more then the haire of your head. But you dare auouch any thing against the testimony of the whole worlde, christian and heathen. To omit auncient examples (least perhaps you say they be past date, the like being ceased in our times, as you doe say of possession) the apparition neere *Augusta* about the yeare 1503. vnder *Maximilian* the first Emperour, is famous, which carried the resemblance of *Margaret a Roth Abbatesse* of *Escheten*, &c could not only be scene and handled, but also speake most significantly. *George Sabin*, a man honored for his learning with the dignity of knighthood by *Charles the 5.* and sonne in law to *Phil. Melancthon*, writeth of three apparitions in his time, one of sixe spirits in the forme of moncks, ferried ouer the Rhene by a fisherman of *Spire*; The second of a whole charriot full of moncks; the third of a maid wooed by a spirit in the similitude of a man. And it is knowne what of late hath happened at *Bertin*, and other places of *Saxony*. At *Spandaw* in *Germany* in the yeare 1594. Sep. 13. the

Theo. Erasmus
de Lamius,
pag. 17.

Sabin, Elg. 1.
Eleg. 7
Eleg. lib. 4
Eleg. 4

diuel appeared in the shape of a man, to a yong youth *Gabriell Crümer*, offering him great ritches if he would promise to be at his pleasure, & this not once, but the second time. To him also appeared *Gabriel* a spirit in shew of a good angel, foure seuerall times. In the same towne the diuel did walke visibly in the view of diuers. It were endlesse to insist vpon reherfall of the manifold examples of this kinde. Yea something to this purpose may be sayd out of holy Scripture. *Chrysostome* writing vpon the patience of *Iob* saith, that he which brought tidings of the house, & destruction of his samely & cattle, was not a man, but a spirit. For if thou wert a man (saith he) how didst thou know that this winde came from the wilderness? or if thou wert there, how hapneth it that thou wast not destroyed with the rest? Some thinge also it maketh (as I thinke) for confirmation hereof, that foure seuerall messengers vse not only the same speech, but the verie same wordes: *I only am escaped to tell thee*. Also that they come so part one after the other, before the former had ended his speech, & that one of them saith *The fire of god is fallen from heauen, and hath burnt vp &c.* *Piscator* saith, that when the diuel came to *Christ* in the wilderness to tempt him, he came in specie viri &c. in the shape of a man, as angels are wont to doe when they appeare vnto men. And this we shall the rather beleue, if we remember that the diuel is said to come vnto *Christ*, to haue speech with *Christ*: that he tempted him in communication. Hither also apperteineth, that witches are said to haue their familiar spirits. Except the diuels did put vpon them bodies, and in them were familiarly conuersant with these wicked weomen, how could there be any familiarity betwene a diuel & a woman? Did not also the angels thus as oft as they did familiarly conuerse with men? Besides who knoweth not this to be verried in daily experience? *Zanchinus* hauing affirmed that (in his iudgment) diuels can assume bodies, and in them appeare, speake &c. vseth these words. More ouer there be very many, & those verie graue writers, who affirme that this hath fallen out often. *Augustine* writeth so of this matter, that he saith it is impudencie to denie it. And a little after *Zanchinus* saith asmuch himselfe. Without the note of impudencie this cannot be denied. And who is there liuing that doubteth of the diuels appearing to some heere and there in visible formes and shapes at this day? Or that witches and diuels in bodies assumed, haue familiar speech & communication together? Doe we not daily heare of such occurrents? Doe not witches in all countries, make thus much knowne by their confessions? with many circumstances therevnto apperteyninge,

Gallobstig.
lib. 11:

Iob. i. v. 15
16. 17. 19:

in *Mach. 4. 3.*

1 Sam. 28. 7:
8:

de operibus
red: part. 1
lib. 4, cap. 16

which all tend to the confirmation hereof. Verily the diuel his assuming of bodies and appearing in them vnto men, is so manifest by experience in all ages, past and present, that we may well say with *Augustine* and *Zanchius*, It is impudencie to deny it. Thus impudent are none, but those who either deny that there are diuels, or witches. The lesser of which is horrible impiety. This then is another vntruth.

And heere (by the way) we may assure our selues that the *Discouersers* deny this latter, and are of opinion *there are no witches, nor any bewitched*. For if diuels cannot assume bodies, without which they cannot appeare, nor haue any familiarity with men: if secondly *Sathan* haue no power to torment, vex or any way to afflict the body of man as these men also tell vs, in affirming that there is no actual possession in these daies of the gospell: how are there any who haue familiar spirits, whome the scripture calleth witches? Or that be afflicted in their bodies by the ministry of *Sathan* & mallice of a witch, which is that we call bewitching? This is something confirmed by their oft quoting of *M. Skelton* his *Discouery of witchcraft*, and their commending of that his exposition of *1. Sam. 28. 8.* &c. Hereby it is manifest that together with *M. Skelton* they hold that there are no witches, nor any at this day bewitched. They doe not indeede deliuer this in plaine tearmes, least happely they should thereby irritate the reuerend Iudges of the land, by making them guilty of shedding much innocent blood: but you see that from some of their publike assertions it is to be gathered by necessary collection: and how they approve of that booke which denyeth witches & witchcraft, yea doe commend it: saying: that *if without prejudice, and with a single respect to the truth, we would but deliberately peruse that priuiledged discourse,* &c. then should we without doubt see a diabolicall discourse published with priuiledge.

Lastly you say that the aforesaid argument is a deceivable *Elench*, from *maybe*, to *being indeede*. I pray you *Discouersers* is not the question of *maybe*? Is not your position in the beginning of this dialogue, *whether spirits & diuels can assume &c.* We vse then no *Elench* in the matter, but you a meere dotage, which like the butcher haue forgotten the knife in your mouth. Besides, this & such like arguments be rather *ab esse, ad posse*, then *a posse ad esse*: as a childe that hath learned but *Suin* & *Possuin*, may (helped a little) be able to tell you.

The second reason for assuming of bodies, are the words of the psalme: *He cast vpon them the fiercenesse of his anger, indignation, and wrath*

wait, by sending angels of euil. Heere you afford a double answer, First, that *Angels of euil*, be angels that were denouncers of euil, that is, *Moses & Aaron*, as *Tremelius* interprets it, with whom you accord. Secondly that whatsoever these Angels be, yet they are saide onlie to be sent among them, not into them, and therefore no prooffe can be had from hence for assuming of bodies.

I reuerence the authority of *Tremelius*, and dare not take vpon me to censure his doing: yet against it I might aheadg the consent of many interpreters. But instead of them all the booke of *wisdom* shall alone serue, which alluding, to this place expoundeth those *Angels of euil*, to be horrible & fearfull sights. *7 by were scattered,* chap. 17:3.
(saith he) feareing horribly, & were troubled with apparitions. Again, 4:14
terrible visions and sorrowfull sights did appeare vnto them. Again,
Sometimes they were troubled with monstrous apparitions. Hereby it is apparant that these angels of euil were construed by the learned Iewes in auncient time, not to be *Moses and Aaron*, but wicked spirits. Secondly, that though they were not sent into the *Aegyptians*, (for then they should haue possessed them, which neuer any affirmed) yet they were sent amongst them in terrible formes, which coulde not be but by assuming some sensible bodies, which is sufficient against you: and as much as is enforced from this scripture. And now let the Reader chuse, whether he will rather follow the booke of *wisdom*, or your booke of folly. pag. 108,

The third argument is: *The diuell assumed the body of the Serpent when he tempted Erab.*

You oppose heerevnto a threefold reply: First, *If the diuell entered essentially into the Serpent, then either he became an essentiall Serpent, or the serpent an essentiall diuell.* Surely you are beset of comon vnderstanding which so confidently blatter out such palpable ignorance. Doth not god essentially dwell in all things? But is the creature thereby made god, or God the creature? Secondly, you say that *the serpent in this place is not a naturall serpent, but metaphorically the diuell.* It were tedious to refute particularly your childish prooffes. If all the circumstances in *Genesis 3.* could not induce you to acknowledg a naturall serpent, as the instrument of sathan in that temptation, yet the Analogie of the second Adam (which wrought our saluation by vntwisting that threed, which the diuell had spun to our destruction) ought to haue preuayled something with you. pag 109. 110
111. 112. 113
 Our Saviour being baptised the spirit of god descended vpon him like a doue: and a voyce from heauen proclaymed him withall to be the beloued sonne of god. By which it is playne that as in ouer- Mar 3. 16:17

throwing the first Adam there was a wicked spirit, so in establishing the second Adam there was the holy spirit: as to deceaue the first there was vsed a serpent, so to confirme the second Adam there was vsed a doue: as the first by the diuels fraud in the serpent, was quite stripped of all sauing graces, and disherited from beinge the sonne of god, so the second by the spirit of truth in the doue, was as it were visibly replenished with the fulnesse of all grace, and not only himself then so/lemnly annoynted to be the sonne of god, but also by whome all the Elect should be made partakers of the same dignity. From whence then I reason by Analogie thus. That if at the second Adam his installing into his office there was visibly and substantially apparant a Doue, wherein was repletuely the holy ghost: then at the deceauing of the first Adam, there was visibly & substantially a serpent, wherein was definitiuely the wicked spirit. The nature of Opposites require that where one is reall, the other should be also reall. And the serpent & the doue be vsually in the scriptures set one against the other. And thus much for your second reply which you shut vp with a *Probatum est*, because *Reignald Skot* houlding the same opinion, his booke and the opinion it self, is very authentically priuiledged in our English Church by publike authority. As for *M. Skot* there is none of any sound vnderstanding, but he allows his iudgmēt better in a *Hoground*, then in a case of diuinitie. And as for his & your *Priuiledge* whereon you brag your selfe so much, take heede least you straying your *M.* his countenance too farr, to beare out your absurdities, he plvck not his cloath o-uer your eares. Your third reply yealds, that *Sathan* was there togither with the serpent, but not in the serpent, and you would faine prououe, The diucl could apply the serpens tongue to his purpose, though he entred not in essentially into him, no lesse then a Minstrell can make his pipes sound what he please, albeit he enter not essentially into the baggs. And in this merry conceyt you sling about your armes like winde mill sayles in a morryce dance, thinking your selues some iolly fellows. But if the pride of your iollity be past, let me demaund of you this question, what is the true efficient of the sounde of the pipe? The minstrell, or the motion of the aer by his breath? You must needs answer it is the motion of the aer: for the pipe will sound as well by a paire of bellowes tyed at his arme, as by the breath of his mouth: as is apparant in Organes and other winde instruments. Beesides it is a rule in nature, That the mouer and the thing moued, must needs touch one an other without entercourse of any thing

pag. 115.

page, 116,

Arift. Phyl.
lib. 8. cap. 2.

thing comming betwene. Now then if the piper be not the true efficient, it is no marueile if no necessity force him to creepe into the bag; but if the breath and the mouing of the aer be the true worker indeed, that must both enter into the bagg, & into the pipe too, or else nothing at all will be donne. But you will reply, that the spirit may be likewise not the principall efficient, but remayning with out as the Minstrell doth, might send something into the serpent to cause such a workinge. I answer, the spirit is the principall efficient. For in supernaturall workes it must needes be the principall mouer should be supernaturall in regard of that worke. And therefore seeing the wicked spirit is cheif agent, it is necessary he should be ioyned immediatly to that which is moued by him, without interposition of any other thinge. If then you can count your game, you shall see you haue got nothing by this reckoning; but only a vaine hope to make your selues merry withall for a time.

The fourth argument for *assuming* bodies is drawne from the *Angels speaking in Balaams asse*, which you labour to infringe two waies: first for that it was not an angell, but *Iehouah himself* which caused that speaking: secondly if it were an angel, yet he speaks no otherwise then the former similitude of a Minstrell did declare. For the first, I answer you argue deceitfully in opposinge Iehouah and an angell in this action, as if they could not be ioynt workers, Iehoua principally, the angell ministerially: especially seeing it is the manner of the scripture to attribute that to the Lord without mention of any other, which notwithstanding he administred by meanes. *Iehoua* (saith *Moses*) *talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fier*. And againe after he hath repeated the ten commandments, he saith: *These words Iehoua spake vnto all your multitude in the mount &c*. In which he teacheth that *Iehoua* was a Law-giuer, & nameth no other whose office was vsed therein: Yet *Stephen* saith, *They receaued the law by the ministry of angels*. And *S. Paule*: *It was ordayned by angels in the hand of a mediator*. You see then how trifling this argument is. But you will say: In the giuing of the lawe, the scripture doth warrant a ministry of angels; but in the matter of *Balaam* no such thing is any where taught, I answer, It is a good rule obserued by some for interpreting the scriptures *Aequalis est doctrina, quae venit a pbrasi equali*. Equall manner of speech doth as-forde equall doctrine. Besides shall we thinke the greatest workes of all other, as the giuing of the law, and the comfortinge of Christ himselfe were performed by angels, & that the Lord reserueth the

Num. 22:30

pag: 117: 118

Deu. 5. 4. 32

A. 7. 53:
Galat. 3. 19.

Luke 22. 43

balest and meanest actions to be done immediatly by himselfe.
 Greate cause therefore had those famous learned men *Lyræ, Martyr, Zanchius, &c.* to acknowledg an angell in this busynesse, whose iudgments if you had wayed and followed, it had bene more commendation for you, then thus to roue at randome with your bolts. Further you vrge, It could not be an angel that opened the asses mouth, *because the Angel stood before Balaam with a drawne sword in his hand to haue slaine him, and Angels can not be in sondry places at the same instant.* I answer, Seeing the Lord did open the mouth of the asse, and *Balaams* eyes by angels as hath bene proved, that not one angell alope, but diuers were vsed in this busynesse. He which hath so many thousand of thousands waiting vpon his throne for all deaignes, should he for defect of seruitors be faine to worke in his owne person? Whereas you say secondly, *Admitting it was an Angell, yet he spake in atherwise then the similitude of a Minstrell declareth,* I answer, If he spake in such sort, he must needes then really be in the asse, considering the true efficient of the pipes sound, is the mouinge of the aer (which is essentially in the pipe) and not the Minstrel. Besids in all things which are moued, the Mouer is immediatly applyed and ioyned vnto the thing moued. And why should Angels necessarily be sent in person to those seuerall places where busynesse lyes, if they were able to accomplish them being absent? I passe over your ridiculous conceit, of the *Angells* essentiall conuersion into the asse, and how he was ridden, and galloped, Or spurred, Or stricken &c. which things no doubt, & more the asse had suffred, if either of you had bene in *Balaams* stead: For set a foole on horseback, and he will gallop.

page 119.

page, 120,
a Sam, 28:

The fifth argument for assuming of bodies, is from the apparition in the likeness of *Samuell*: which example, if you bounde your question with strict tearmes of a true naturall body, we vse not in proofe of this matter. For the sounder iudgment is, That apparition was a meere phantasie and illusion of Sathan. But if you intend (as indeede you doe) that euil spirits take vpon them neither true nor phantasticall bodies, that is, which be truly materiall & visible, though not compacted of flesh and bone, in which sense only we oppose it to a true body in this place, then this example is of force to presse you. You incline to *Reig. Skott*'s opinion who would haue it but a meere cosening trick of the witch at Endor, without any apparition at all either to the king, or to the witch. But this fancy waiteth sufficient foundation to stand on. *M. Skott* would prouoe that

page, 125.

Saul

Saule saw nothing, because he asked the witch what she saw, and what was his forme? It is true that Saule saw nothing at first, for things were donne by degrees, as the text plainly shewes. Before the resemblance of Samuëll came vp, the witch saw other spirits like Gods ascending, then when they were vanished she beheld the forme of Samuëll, yet not fully ascended: at which time she cryed out and answered Saul his demaund. After the Image was now perfectly come vp, Saul also himself saw him, as may be gathered by his bowing himself and falling downe: for otherwise Saul, was of that temper both in regard of his regall dignity, and his own naturall courage, that it was not his manner to stoope to nothing. If one then shall reason thus, Saul saw nothing when he asked the question, therefore neither afterwards when he bowed himselfe, there is no validity in such a consequence. Therefore M. Skott failes much in his prooffe: he hath not sufficiently shewed that nothing appeared unto Saul. And admitting he had cleared that, yet this was but one part of his taske. He should also haue made it plaine that neither the witch saw any thing, beefore he had growne to this generall conclusion of no apparition at all. The diuel at this day visibly appeareth to many of our wise-men and wise-women, when they whicht cõe to aske counsaile of them, neither see nor heare any thing, but haue their answer at the second hand from their mouth. Were it so then that Saul neither saw nor heard any thinge, but what he receaued from the witch, this notwithstandinge, there might well be an apparition: and without controuersy there was so. Otherwise how coulde the witch haue knowne Saul? and foretould those things which afterward fell out accordingly? To the former of these you answer (and what ye will say to the latter we shall know hereafter) that she of herselfe might and did know him very well, howsoeuer she dissembled the same for the present. This is incredible.. That a silly woman dwellinge far from the court, should so well knowe the King, that though he changed himselfe, put on other rayment, & went by night, accompanied only with two men, and thus did what he coulde to be vnknowne, (because being knowne he could not bringe his purpose to passe) yet she should know him. Especially if withal we remember, that she was a witch, or at least reputed so to be, & that Saul had destroyed the witches, and forcerers out of the land: and therefore she coulde haue small harte to looke the king so often in the face, whereby to attaine to this perfect knowledge of him. And where you say that the consecrẽ performed to Saul, was cunningly deliuered

1 Sam: 28: 13

14.

Page 115:

Page 116.

delivered by the witch alone in her cell, she being a cunning Ventriloquist, as all Pythonists are: who can very hydeouslie speake in the bottom of their bellies, with an hollow counterfeyt voice, and therein by practise she was verie expert. I answer: you may tell vs also that the moone is made of a greene cheefe, but we may chuse whether we will beleue you. Yea, I for my part will as soone beleue this, as that. For how could this silly woman (with all her cunning and craft) foretell, first the ouerthrow of the Israelites. 2. that it shoude be on the morrow. 3. that in that ouerthrow Saul and his sonnes should be slaine. Nei theris it credible that she was able to make knowne to Saul the true cause of this feirce wrath of the Lorde, ready to be executed vpon him, and that his kingdome being rent from him, should be giuen to Dauid: all which be mentioned in this conference. Moreover, if the witch did vse a meere cosinage, and that she herselfe did see nothing, it should seeme this art of sorcery, consisteth only in the opinion of men, and that in very deede witches can doe no more by Spirits, neither haue any greater familiarity with the, then all others haue. But then wherefore doth the scripture condemne them for *counseling with spirits*? and mention their *haunting of familiar spirits*? For these reasons I thinke it stands better with reason to ioyne with the vniuersall consent of all the learned, then to follow M. Skott his singuler opinion, though the discourse be *priviledged*. Hitherto for your refutation.

Deut: 18, 11.
1 Sam. 28, 7.
3.

pag: 127,
128.
Mag sent, lib
2, distinct: 8.

The shutting vp of this Dialogue alleadgeth some authorities for Not assuming bodies, none of all which make to the purpose. Peter Lombard propoundeth a double question, first *whether diuels do substantially enter into the bodies of men*: the second *whether they essentially slip into their mindes*. To the first he answers doubtfully, but doth not deny it as these Discourfers doe. To the second negatiue-ly. Then you produce the testimony of Gennadius, Beda, & Augustine: which likewise deny an essentiall entrance into the minde. But what is this to *essentials entering into the body*? These are two things distinct, and if you had not purposed fraud, you would not haue alleadged authorities denying an essentiall entrance into the mindes, to disproue essentiall entrance into the body. Touching the rest of your testimonies, I am ashamed to spend time in rehearsing them. I graunt with Chrysostome, the diuel cannot compell to sinne, but suggest: with Lysa, that he is not formally in any, as the firme of that body wherein he is: with Musculus, That he hath no absolute authority, but a subiected seruitude: with Gregory, that the power of Satan is

THE 5. DIALOGVE.

35

never winst, though this will be all as well as with T. if negatius, that
 in our nature cannot receive any other to make one person with it (ex-
 cepted only the forme of gold) then an humane being. I graunt you
 a touch these testimonies. though but what gane you thereby for
 strengthening your cause? It is great toly to trouble your Reader
 with such impertinent wordes. In the last place comes Reig: Skot to
 make all sure. Inceede his testimony is pregnant for you. But in
 the wordes you cite out of him be some new two infamous senten-
 ces; That the diuells cannot by any means make them selves seeme that
 to assume a body for appearance, or other service, is all one as if the spirit
 leaving the essence of a spirit, should become corporall. For so is the
 meaning of his wordes. And what is his reason? why (forsooth) the
 diuill by his nature is a spirit, and therefore invisible & insensible, and
 this is contrary to his nature. By this reason there was neuer appa-
 rition of holy angels: for they be likewise spirits, invisible, insen-
 sible &c. Surely they which made trees in times past to call parliam-
 ents, spake with as great probability, as Mr. Skot hath affirmed this,
 as is apparant by that already let downe.

page. 129.

A Summary of the Fifth Dialogue.

The fifth Dialogue treateth of *Transformation*, the second speciall
 of *Corporall possession*. As if either by assumption of bodies, or change
 of forme, a corporall possession were wrought, as the nature of ge-
 nerals doth require to be fully comprehended in the whole summe of
 their specialls: and as if all transformation were bodily possession, wh
 ich is as untrue, as the former distribution unskilfull. The conclusi-
 on propounded is, That Spirits & diuells cannot essentially transform
 their essence into any true natural body. In which sentence the Dis-
 course is vnderstand Transformation to be a perfect change of one essence
 into another, as if a spirit utterly chaunging his nature, & ceasing to
 be a spirit should be made in verie essence a man, or some such oth-
 er thing: or else that he not transforming himselfe but transforming
 another, should change the essence of a man into the essence of a
 Wolfe, or any other nature. In which is to be noted a double asser-
 tion. First that they dispute as a doubt, which neuer entred into a
 mans mind, for one thing I can finde, to make any question of, to wit,
 whether spirits might perfectly leave their owne nature, & easily ch-
 ange themselves into another being. Indeed this were a happy trans-

formation for them, if they could cease to be diuels, and so escape their condemnation. But neither wiseman nor foole I thinke, euer dreamed of such a thing. Secondly, that they confound all apparitions, and appearances with their transformation: as if the diuel could not cast sensible shewes of things before vs, yea and true bodies themselves, without either transforming himselfe, or some other thing into them. And thus by this occasion they runne i. to their former question againe, sometimes making their Transformation to be nothinge else but an assuming of bodies, eyther in truth, or in shew. Concerning which sufficient hath bene said in suruey of the former dialogue: And what the spirits power is in this behalf, is apparent by the Egyptian sorcerers rods, turned (at least in shew) into serpents; by the frogs, and the waters turned into blood: by the apparition of Samuels bodie, by those fearefull sights which troubled the Egyptians, yea by the disciples of our Saviour Christ the selues, which seeing they had seene a spirit, when they beheld our Saviour walking on the waters, declare what the iudgment, of the Church was then concerning apparition of spirits in sensible forms: neither doth our Saviour reproue that opinion, but only shewes there was no cause of feare, he beinge no such as they imagined.

I therefore I neede not trouble the reader with discouering, How the duell is transformed into an angel of light, or how Nebuchadnezzar became an oxe, or in rippinge up any of that discourse followinge: onle

let vs consider that which is alleaded from our Saviour Christes speech, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me haue.* Which wordes seeme to make against this assuming of bodies by spirits. For if they doe take vppon them sensible humane bodies, how is the argument of our Saviour firme? The disciples might haue replied, that howsoeuer spirits haue not flesh and bones naturally, yet they assume humane bodies for a time, visible and palpable, & therefore the iudgment of sence could not be sufficient warrant to put away their feare. For answer heerevnto, Thomas Aquinas & other of the Schoole men think, our Saviours argument to be of small strength, except some other addition be made vnto it. But herein the scholemen were deceaued, as also many others, in that they frame the argument from part only of our Saviours words, and not from the whole. Our Saviour doth not (meerely) reason thus, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones, But I haue flesh & bones, and therefore am no spirit,* as I see the argument is vulgarly taken, but more fully in this sort, *A spirit hath not flesh & bones, as you see me haue.* which wordes afford

Wisd 17
Math. 24. 26

pag 156. 157
Luk. 24. 38.

humane, that
is like, to
mans

afford this syllogisme. *A Spirit hath not in a true humane body pearced hands & pearced feete, as mine were lately on the crosse: But I heere present haue in a true humane body pearced hands and pearced feete, as they were a few dayes since vpon the crosse (whereof be your selues witneses in seeing and feeling me) and therefore I heere present am no spirit, but verily your Lord and Maister, who was lately crucified.*

And this is strengthened by the words precedent to the aforesaide Scripture, and subsequent. *Behould (saith Christ) my hands and my feete, for it is I my selfe: handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh & bones, as ye see me haue. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feete.* As it the Lord had said, You suppose this bodie that stands thus on the suddaine before you, is not mine, but the phantasticall body of a spirit. But you are deceaued, for it is I my selfe. And that you may be out of doubt, looke vpon me, and handle me. A spirit hath not a true naturall body, consistinge of flesh, blood, and bone &c. but only the similitude of these things, and therefore this my true humane body you may easily discern from such, if care and circumspection be vsed by you: View me therefore well, and handle me. The softnesse of my flesh, the hardnesse of my bones, that viall and sweete warmnesse that is perceaued in a living body, and is proper vnto it, which you may feele, doe witness that it is my body you doe behould, and not a spirit. But certain may you be hereof, if you looke vpon my hands and feete, which you know (according to the scripture) were lately pearced. Heere I shew you them. Doe you not see the marks thereof? and the hoales which the nayles haue made in them? we may add heerevnto the exceeding great ioy which did heerevpon arise in the disciples. For it followeth, *And while they beleued not for ioy, that the Lord was risen, & wondered thereat &c.* This excessive ioy nothing caused so much, as the behoulding and handling of the visible and palpable markes of his peiring. Had not Christ shewed & they beheld and handled these bloudie markes, and certaine marks of Christs owne bodie, they had not vndoubtedly so abounded in ioy, but rather continewed still troubled, and in their former doubt, at least in part, and some of them, if not all. Hereby it is plain, that this scripture maketh for apparitions, and not against them. If the reason drawne from this scripture were of any validity against apparitions, then could not the holy angels assume bodies, neither had there euer bene apparition of them, which we knowe is ouerthrown by many places of scripture.

For the rest of the Dialogue we are behoulding to *Lycanthropus*, which hath kept so good *Discipline* in all the former Discourses, that he neuer howled forth like a wolve till now. Your facility is more ruseous in speedy curing his disease. In you proceede with like success in this kinde, you will quickly surpass the *Excess* at *Magnitudo*. *Lycanthropus* was but a tole, that he complained not himselfe at your first meeting. It seemeth he might have had present help. But take heede Mr. *Harsnet* be not sent from his Lord with Comission to examine the matter of some Legerdemaine. And thus having run the race of this Dialogue, you make a passage to the next comming now to *Actual Possession*, which is the opposite member to *Reall*. Whereby it will that neither the one hath any reall power without. For whatsoeuer he doth exercise outwardly, it is actually onely faith your goodly diuision, and so by your account he shall be really no where.

A Survey of the Sixt Dialogue.

page 166.

The sixt Dialogue handleth *Actual possession*, which they describe to be an extraordinary affliction, vexation, or torment, that *Sathan* doth effectually inflict vpon men for a time. And this *actual affliction* and *torment* very vniuersally they oppose to that is generally called *possession*. Whereas whosoever is possessed according to that we define possession, the same is *actually*, & *effectually* (as they speak) *afflicted*, *vexed*, or *tormented* by *Sathan*. Where therefore either the spirit of god in the sacred Scriptures speaking of *Demoniacke* mentioneth only their *vexation* by the spirit, or any learned writer, that maketh not at all against vs, or for you, as you very sillily pretend. The question and controuersy is, (whereof we haue spoken already) whether the diuel thus vexing a *Demoniacke*, be within him, (definitiuely) as we affirme: or without him, as you auouch: and not whether *Demoniacke* be *effectually* vexed by *Sathan* when vexation you opposing to that we call *possession*, and by it going about to disproue a *possession*, doe therein like vnto him, that should deny a man to haue a soule, because he hath a body: and that by prouing he hath a body, will proue that he hath no soule. There be 2. partes of possession. 1. The diuel his inherencie in the body of man. 2. the diuel his vexing of that bodie.

Math. 17. 17.

Actus 5. 17.

see pag. 8

32, 6. 63.

pag. 168.

This *possession* of diuels is acknowledged to haue bene in the times of Christ: doe finally deny any further continuance thereof now, in this

time of the gospell.

The contrary heretvnto, to wit, the perpetuity of possession, I have heretofore proued by Scripture, & by reason; & namely thus.

All the diseases that sinne made the body of man subject vnto, doe or may remaine so long as sinne remaineth in man.

But possession is a disease that sinne made the body of man subject vnto.

Therefore possession doth or may remaine so long as sinne remaineth in man. And so as this day may, vntil the end of the world.

This argument hath as yet receiued no answer from you, nor I trust neuer shall. Instead thereof you haue fathered as absurd an argument vpon me, as euer I read: sending the Reader to the 31. page of the *Doftrine*, to secure him it is mine: and therevnto forsooth haue you returned an answer. A very easie matter; euen as it is for one in straits to helpe himselfe with a lye. If at once (Gentle Reader) thou wouldest see cleerely as in a glasse, how corruptly these men deale with my poore writings, & shamefully abuse both thee, and me, but most of all themselves: then compare pages 174, 175, of their *Dialogicall Discourses*, with the 31. of the *Doftrine*.

But for the further pursuite and enlarging of the aforesaide argument, we are to vnderstand that all punishment due to the breach of god his law, is so long perpetuall, as the breach of gods law doth continue. Cursed is every one which abideth not in all things which are written in the booke of the law, to doe them. This sentence is perpetually true to the ende of the world. And albeit they, which haue put on Christ, and be dead and risen againe with him, are freed from this curse, yet all that be called, be not chosen: nor every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall haue him to beare their burthen, but shall feelee the waight of their owne transgressions. Besides the faithfull are not exempted from the temporall chastisement. Neither are the written plagues only the stipend of sinne, but all other evils whatsoever not mentioned, are scourges prepared of the Lord for sinners. If thou wilt not heepe, and doe all the words of this Law, the Lord will bring vpon thee euery sickness, and euery plague which is not written in the booke of this law. And that possession is a curse or plague of god, it needeth no prooffe. Yea a greuous one it is: that he which was framed the temple of the holy spirit, shoulde become a most horrible Caue and Denne of Sathan. From hence it must needes follow, that possession must haue a perpetuall beinge in the world, so long as men shall continue disobedient to god his

In the doctrine,
pag. 17, 18.
Doftrine
pag. 11:

pag 174,

Galat. 3:10

Deut. 28:38,
61

1. Cor. 4. 4
Ephes. 2.
Ephes. 6, 12

most holy commandments. Moreover, howsoever Sathans king dome is abolished for the behalf of the elect, yet in respect of the wicked he is a god of this world, a prince of the air, & a principallity, a power, a worldly government of the darknesse of this world. Doth the scriptures give him these titles as if he was a god without a people, a king without a kingdome, a principallity without all sway and authority in his subjects. Therefore except you can shew vs, that none of the wicked now dares be of sathans kingdome, or that he doth rule his kingdome without tyranny, or that his tyranny hath not wayting vpon it possession, or that possession is now no punishment or chastisement for sinne: you shall deserue that as your booke goes now abroad vnder priuiledge, so hereafter your selues should haue a priuiledge for euer setting forth any more booke.

As the perpetuity of possession is and hath bene proued by the holy scriptures, and by reason, so accordingly there haue bene *Demoniacs* from Christs time in the successiue ages vntil this day. That such there were for the space of 13. hundred yeares from Christ, appeareth by the ecclesiasticall histories called the *Cenuries*, as witnesseth *Cent. 2. pag. 110. Cent. 3. pag. 136. Cent. 4. pag. 439 440. Cent. 5. pag. 684 685. Cent. 6. pag. 341. Cent. 7. 158. 159. Cent. 8. 341. et 375. Cent. 9. 265. Cent. 10. 320. et 337. Cent. 11. 286 et 310. Cent. 12. 909. 910. et 937. Cent. 13. 621.* This perpetuity is further confirmed by the testimonie and iudgement of these writers following, who for the most part make mention of *Demoniacs* in their times. *Iustine Martyr* saith, that the christians ouer all the world healed very many that were possessed with evil spirits: which other enchaunters, sorcerers, & sacrificers could not performe. & as yet (saith he) those men of ours proceede in their purpose. See also *Iustine Martyr* in *Tyrphone*. We are accustomed (saith *Tertullian*) to assaile diuels & to drive them away from men. And againe: We drive out ill spirits with our reward or hire. See *Tertullian* in *lib. de Corona militis*. For breuity (especially in so plaine a case) I will omit the other testimonies, & only name the seuerall writers with the booke and page. *Cyrian ad Demetrian tract. 1. et Sermones de lapsis: et de Idololatriæ nauitate: et lib. 4. epistolarum. epistola 7. ad Magnu. Soz in lib. 4. cap. 16. Idem lib. 6. cap. 28. Canon. 90. Theodor. et lib. 4. cap. 21. Chrysostome in Tom. 5. de incomprehensibili dei natura hom. 4. Augustine lib. 8. de ciuitate dei. cap. 26. Eusebius Caesariensis lib. 6. cap. 43. Bullinger in Math. 8. 28. Pet. Martyr loc. com. Sess. 4. Cap. 9. Sect. 16: Chyrenus in Math. 8. 28. Hunnius in Math. 17. 15. Philip Melancthon in lib.*

Epistolarum.

Apol. 1. Pag. 246.

In Apolog.

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

41

*Epistolarium. Chemicum de Sacramento Ordinis. Rega born. 26. in
historiam passionis, adit. 2. pag. 656. Fogellius in Thesaur. Theologi-
co. pag. 980. Darius in Marci quest. 38. Chassanion loc. com. lib. 1.
cap. 17. Piscator in Math. 8. 28. But what neede these testimonies
specially of the auncient writers, sith the Discouersers themselves ac-
knowleing a generall consent among the learned writers, as touch-
ing the continuance of possession for about eight hundred yeares af-
ter Christ and that in these wordes. Howsoever Iuliane, T. viulhan, Cy-
prian, Augustine, the countaile of Ezechia, &c. ecclesiast. all histories doe
all ioyntly aenough the continuance of possession in these times and places
wherein they conuerfed; yet no one of them all doe challenge extraordina-
ry power to dispossesse Satan. But all these (say our Discouersers) were de-
ceaued, either by the cunning of the counterfeits, or by mistaking some dis-
ease, not much vnlike possession, for possession it selfe. Thus sell these good
Fathers into a strange imagination of some actual possession: there being
indeede no such thing at all. Is it not strange that these two petty fel-
lowes, that are euery foote stunbling, and haue as many lyes al-
most in their mouthes as they haue propolitions, should so boldly
controule these famous Doctors, and writers of Ecclesiasticall
 storie, and condemne them as men simple, deceaued, and not able
to discern of this matter. It seemes your Priuledge hath so inspi-
red you, that the certaine knowledg of these things is to be drawne
only out of your breasts. Let vs heare therefore the profound rea-
sons which these great Clarkes haue, against possession in these daies
of the gospell.*

PAGE 171.

The first argu-
ment aga-
inst the per-
petuall of
possession:
page 168.
Ans.

The first is this. God hath not aenoughed the perpetuall of possession
in any part of his word, therefore it was temporary, and no way perpe-
tuall.

Your proposition is false. For though it be not set down in expre-
sse wordes: yet thence it is to be proued by necessary collection, as
is euident by the premisses. Secondly, were it true: It maketh suffi-
ciently for the perpetuall of possession, that by holy scripture it can
be proued, that sometimes there was possession, and that were pos-
sessed: except some scripture may be shewed for the abolishing of it.
Otherwise I say, it remayneth still, so as it either is, or may be at
this day.

In the second place you reason thus. If no extraordinary power, or
meanes for expelling of diuels remaineth perpetuall, then neither posses-
sion it selfe remaineth perpetuall. But the first (say you) is true, therefore
the second.

page 170.
Aug. 2.

The

A SURVEY OF

42

Anst.

Math. 17. 18

Mark. 9. 19

The proposition is false. Because there was not only an extraordinary means for the expelling of diuels, which being temporary, ceased with miracles, but besides an ordinary means particularly & by name appointed for the dispossessing of diuels, which remaineth vntill this day, and is perpetuall. Yea had we no such particuler ordinance, yet notwithstanding we might at this day haue remedy against this extraordinary euill. Call vpon me, (saith God) in the day of trouble, & I will deliuer thee. Whatsoeuer you shall aske my father (saith our Sauour) in my name, that he will giue vnto you. Pray alwaies, saith S. Paul. what? only in ordinary necessities? or else in extraordinary too, but yet without comfort of obtaining? hath the Lord bound himselfe from all extraordinary visitation till the ende of the world? Or if any vnwonted thing shall happen, is the church destitute of all remedy? Againe, we haue no extraordinary power remaining wherewith to cure palsy's, seauers, and other diseases sometimes so cured, and yet notwithstanding the said diseases at this day remaine. And why may not as well this disease be now, notwithstanding we haue no extraordinary power wherewith to heale it? who would vouchsafe to spend time with such disputers? Then to come to your second proposition, let vs heare your proofe. Because say you extraordinary power of casting out diuels was peculiarly appropriated to Christ & his owne Disciples, which is a low de vnto truth, vnderstanding Disciples as you doe, onely for the Apostles. Doth not our Lord say, These signes shall follow those that beleue in my name, they shall cast out diuels &c. Of whome speaketh he this? Of his owne disciples? Or of the seauentie? It is most manifest he speaketh of those which should beleue by their preaching. Wee stand not vpon an extraordinary power for expelling of Satan, & therefore I might well haue let this proposition passe, but that I would let you see your not extraordinary but ordinary blindness.

Mark 16. 17

Page 176

Arg. 3.

But to let this passe, your third argument concludeth thus. Things in themselves perpetuall existing, haue in themselves an ordinary & continuall working: But possession of diuels (in these daies of the gospel) is in it selfe neither ordinary, nor continually working, & therefore in these daies there is no possession existing.

I answer that perpetuall existing is twofould: Naturall, and Positiue. Things naturall which haue an inseperable operation accompanying them, so long as they haue an existing, must needs also haue a continuall working, as the fyre must needs heate, the water moyten, &c. In this sence I doe not say that possession is perpetuall

ually

usually existing, for then euermore some should be posselt, which is far from my thought: but that men now and hereafter euen to the worlds ende may be possessed, when and as oft as the Lord shall please in such manner (that is with this kinde of correction) to cha-
 stise men: as appeareth by that here followeth. Things Politie be such as not by nature but by ordinance haue their power and efficacie. Of which sort be Lawes and Constitutions, which once inacted haue presently existing, yet notwithstanding for want of Execution that sleepeeth perhaps vpon diuers occasions for many yeares, haue not their continuall working. Now possession being a punishment of sinne, and an ordinance of God, is of the seconde kinde, wherein if one shall exa^m one usuall course to be pra^{ct}ised every moment without ceasing, it is as much as to prescribe the Lord & appoint him when and how he shall inflict his iudgments. What was to haue a more perpetuall existing amongst the people of the Iewes then the religion of God in those holy rites & ceremonies which himselfe had giuen from heauen? Of what were they to expect a more constant and continuall succession, then of their prophets, the Lord hauing promised *he would raise them vp a prophet like to Moses, in whose mouth he would put his word*: yet we know what long interruption oft was made by the Idolatry of the people, the wickednes of their kings, and at the last their deserved captiuitie. Insomuch that the Prophet complaineth *See not our signes, there is not one Prophet in vs, nor any with vs that kn^{ow} with how long*. Yea from Malachi til John Bapt^{ist}. what long and deepe silence was there, as if the Lordes promises had beene fallen to the ground? So in the Christi-
 an Church during all the raigne of Antichrist, hath not the truth been hidde in the wilderness, as if it had bene vtterly extinct & departed from the earth? The Papists cry out vpon vs to shew the visible tra^{ces} of our Church, and you would helpe them with armour, if this might be graunted: *that things perpetuall existing by ordinance should also haue a continuall working*. I hope nothing ought to be more perpetuall then faith, yet our Saviour demaundeth whether at his coming *he shall finde it on the earth*. The second proposition also is worthely proued, For whereas you should shew, that possession hath no ordinary working, you tell vs. *It is now adaires so vnknown and so rare in experience, as very hardly it is heard of in twenty yeares space*. Admitt this, I hope if it be heard of in twenty yeares it is not altogether so strange for the daies of the Gospell, as you would make it. Neither is twenty yeares space such a discontinuance, but that you

Deut. 18. 15.
16.

Mal. 4. 5.

Luk. 19. 44.

Mat. 23. 35.

might as well conclude the Leprosie, the Cancer, the Apoplexie, & some other rare diseases did all like wise determine with the Apostles time.

Arg. 4.
pag. 179
& Ans 55.

The fourth argument followeth. The manifestation of Christ his Deity, & the confirmation of his glorious gospel, were the maine causes of possion in Christ his time: these causes being ceased long since, how should the effect that selfe be still continued?

Ans.

This obiection I have already answered in the Doctrine pag. 30. 31. 32. where I shew that except there two were the only causes of possion notwithstanding the ceasing of these causes, possion may remaine, y^e lo^g at an other cause thereof may arise, & wit^h meane, I hat there were not these causes, you y^eu. seues do it esse. esse, in causing them the maine cause, and the maine ends of possion; & in affirming, that the possion of anieles were effectually by these two ends.

Doctrine
pag. 31. 32.

Indee in your Answer page 87. (contradicting your selues) you say these were the two maine ends of possion. But how prooue you that by the Scriptures? For who is a you of counsaile with the Lord, that you are so presumptuously and directly set downe these for the maine causes of this iudgement? It is not possible that this which you thus presumptuously affirme, should be true. Such as heretofore I have declare. If there were possessions, before either the gospel was preached vnto the Gentiles, or the Lord manifested in the flesh. Moreover the line of Ieremias, within which they could neuer haue bene vexed by Sathan, was a case of possession, how then were the two afore said, the onely causes of possession. To the former of these reasons you answer, there were no possion at all (for a long time especially before the coming of Christ.) chulish answer, I sing in my said reason that is made the contrarye evident. In stead of answering in another reason we haue a hinder. You charge me to say, that possion was especially and perfectly w^hsted vpon men for sin; and this I do. If your owne making you lab^or to ouerthrow, whereas I onely affirm that besides the afore said causes, sinne was a cause, which is the cause of all iudgements, which I doe not respect not that principally busines for others, but know it to be so.

Ans.
pag. 68.

Ans.
pag. 56

But cheifely you ground he shall determine the power of possion vpon a blind vnderstanding of these words of the Gospel. Now is the iudgement of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. Cōce nide which whe I consider how many vaine words & leaues be sp^oke, I call to minde the great paynes the Smith taketh in framing

doctrine
Pag. 33
* 12-10-11
his owne g^o
rie
page 179,
Ioh. 12. 31.

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

43

Leaming his Idolatrous Image. How he worketh in the colles, and *after*
with it with banners, and worketh it with the strength of his armes.
 yet he is an hungred, & his strength faileth, he drinketh no water, & is
 faint. For these Disciples having framed an Idole interpretation
 in their owne braines, weary & enuies to adorne it all that euer
 they may, though when they haue done what they can it is no-
 thing else but an abominable frensie, I giue it no harder terme then
 it deserues. For to come to the matter, I hele not t. x. ianours but
 Prophaneours of God his truth, would haue the casting south of the Pr-
 ince of this world by the death of Christ, to be nothing else but a fi-
 nall determination of Satbans actual possession, that is, that the bene-
 fit of Christ his death should onely pertaine to Demoniacks, men
 extraordinarylie tormented with the diuel. For the triute of deliue-
 rance from Actual possession belongeth onely to such kinde of men.
 But by these mens auaricity, I be casting south of the Prince of this wor-
 lde, is nothing else but a deliuerance from actual possession, & so this
 benefit of Christ his death shall be appropriated to men extraordi-
 narily vexed by Satan. Are your consciences so seared that you co-
 uld be content to spoyle Christians of their cheifett comfort? But I
 neede not spend time in expostulating with you. There is none
 which loues the truth, but of humilitie will easily acknowledge what
 such deprauiours deserue. It shall be enough for me, if any be de-
 ceived by you, & contunue your falshood. Our Saviour, therewith by
 his owne expresse words, that the casting south of the Prince of this wo-
 rld, should be the drawing of all nations vnto him: for so he speaketh
 in the next verse. And I, i. I meane lift up in the earth, will draw all
 men vnto me: which I hope is a more ample fruit of Satbans expulsi-
 on, then can be restrained onely to men in vnwonted manner afflict-
 ed by him. Likewise the Grecia, sel pr to se our Saviours, which oc-
 casion did moue this speech, doth manifestly declare the casting south
 of Satbans should be the admitting of the Gentiles into the kingdome of
 God. This also was that which the voice from heauen pronounced,
 wherein the nam of God should be glorified, and not the deliuerance
 of some few speciall men, from this one parte of Satbans tyrannie.
 Besides our Saviour here reileth vs that a session and a most sol-
 lemne iudgement should be holden, wherein the mighty Iehovah
 sits Iudge. Iesus Christ is plaintiffe, and Satan defendant. Shall we
 thinke all this solemnity had no other ende but onely that Actual
 possession might be condemned? Or rather that the mighty God in-
 ding the cause betwene his Elect and Satan, did now in regard of

1644:137

ver; 21

his

his Sonne his merite fully satisfiing his iustice, giue sentence against Sathan with his chosen, and thereby expell him from that kingdom which heretofore he had generally holden, that in al nations by the preaching of the word, children might be begotten to the Lord. This were sufficient to controule your wicked error, yet because the matter is waighty, we will consider a place or two more. *S. Paul* to the *Colossians* explaineth this point most fully. And y^e eslaith he which were dead in sinnes, and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickned together with him, forgiving you all your trespasses, & putting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against vs, &c. And hath spoyled the principalities and powers, and hath made a shew of them openly, & hath triumphed over them in the same cr^{oss}. In which wordes, he doth as it were comment vpon this speech of our Saviour, declaring How Sathan is call forth: what is the benefit, and to whome it belongeth. The manner of Sathan casting to this, by satisfiing the iustice of god, signified by cancelling the hand-writing. & by spoyling principalities & powers &c. Is the hand-writing cancelled only for Demoniacks? That benefit is: A quickning together with Iesus Christ and the forgiveness of all trespasses. Are the sinnes of demoniacks onely forgiven, and they onely quickned? Nay many which are dispossessed are not quickned with Christ, nor have their trespasses forgiven, but being emptie, swept, and garnished, are repossessed with seauen worse diuels then they were at the first. Except perhaps the sentence was only terrible in the time of our Saviour, but now after his death is no more to be feared, possession by your wise interpretation being fully determined. To whom this benefit belongeth, are they which were dead in sinnes, & in the uncircumcision of the flesh. Are onely Demoniacks such? Is not this the estate of all the Elect before they be called? Thus much *S. Paul*. In the Epistle to the *Hebrewes* likewise the same is most plaine, where it is affirmed, that Christ took humane nature vpon him, that in the same he might destroy through death, him that had the power of death, that is the diuel. And that he might deliuer all them which for feare of death were all their life time subiect to bondage, where also it is plaine how Sathan was throwne out, and that the fruit redounds to al that were oppressed with feare of death, which number is infinite, besides Demoniacks. Where it is to be obserued, how these Discourses alleadinge this text, euer when they come to the fifteenth verse, which they see doth vtterly ouerthrow them, shrink back againe, not daring to touch it, as if some scorpion lay vnder this stone.

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

47

stone, which makes me thinke, they doe not so much ignorantly, as of purpose peruert the scripture. But let vs (by the way) see how they doe vige this Scripture to their purpose: This word *destruction* (say you) cannot fithly be applyed to *Sathan* his power of obfession, but must necessarily be appropriated to his power of possession, which was not on-
pag. 185.
 ly much maymed, but viterly destroyed by the death of our Saviour, so as none can be posselt now in these daies of the gospel. If this here said of the diuel is; to be appropriated to the power of possession, the hath Christ destroyed the diuel onely for Demoniacs. By this your interpretation also of the word *destroy*, none can now doe the workes of the diuel, none can at this day lye, slaunder, commit murther, whore-dom &c. For 1. *Iob. 3. 8.* it is said that Christ hath appeared to destroy the workes of the diuel, and thus you your selues translate the worde. Breifly none of the regenerate can sinne, sith it is said the
pag. 186.
 olde man (of such) is crucified with Christ, that the body of sinne might be destroyed. But to returne thither whence I haue digressed.
Rom. 6, 6.

Lastly from the interpretation which you doe giue of *Iob. 12. 31.* it must necessarily follow, which you also boldly deliuer for truth, that by Christ the power of possession was finally determined, & viterly annihilated; that an ende was made of this busines. And againe, that our Saviour Christ put a finall end to the possession of diuels by his death and resurrection. Now how can this possibly be true, sith after Christ his death and resurrection many were possessed with diuels, as is plaine by the *Actes* of the *Apostles*? Besides after our Lord was risen, he foretels that some beleeuers should in his name cast out diuels. Heerevnto you answering, graunt that there were indeed possessions & dispossessions, a time (that is a little time) after Christ his death & re-
Ans. pag. 46:
Mark. 16: 17.
pag. 197:
 surrection, for confirmation of his glorious gospel, but none at all for the declaration of Christ his Deitie. But how is it proued? why *M. Deacon* and *M. Walker* say it. That we may plainly see that this is an absurd shift, we must remember that the miracles wrought by the *Apostles* or others as well after as before Christs death, serued for confirmation of Christ his Deitie. First in that Christ is the subiect or matter of the gospel. That therefore which maketh for the confirmation of the truth of the gospel, (which the miracles wrought by the *Apostles* after Christs death did, by their owne confession) must needs make for confirmation of this Christ, that he is the true Messiah, and Saviour of the world. And if of Christ, then both of his Deity and humanity. For Christ is a person consisting of these two natures. Again, the gospel teacheth the Deitie of Christ. whatsoever

miracles then confirme the gospel, the same confirme *Christ's Deity*. Moreover, the miracles, & namely the dispossessions of the Apostles, or of any other wrought after Christs resurrection, were wrought in the name of Christ, and therefore confirme *Christ his Deity*. In my name (saith Christ) they shall cast out devils. And this they should doe after his resurrection. I command thee (saith Paul) in the name of Iesus Christ, that thou come out of her, & be came out. Tell me now ye *Dispossessors*, whether this dispossession of S. Paul and such like dispossessions, performed after Christ his resurrection, whereof we reade in the *Acts*, made not for the confirmation of Christ his deity. Behoulde the palpable darknelle that hath covered you: which notwithstanding you feele not, nor in respect thereof. keepe your ieiues still and quiet without stirring in your places, as the Egyptians did: but you thrust it out, and waik bolle, as in the clearest sunn shine, by so much more miserable then the Egyptians were. But if you will be so hardy, you must thanke your ieiues, if you breake your shinnes, for you can hardly breake your faces, and it may be this doth make you so venterous.

pag 181

You prosecute your absurd interpretation of *Leu 12*. further by conference of some scriptures, which either you doe not, or will not vnderstand: by a Resolution making little to the purpose, and lastly by the testimonies of diuers: wherein you haue a notable grace, to abuse mens names and wordes contrary to their meanings. Bring one approued author if you can, that restrayneth the casting out of the Prince of the worlde, to the deliuerance of demoniackes, and to the ending or final determination of possession: which if you cannot, what a shame is it, or rather a wickednes not to be borne, to soyst in the names of good Authors, and some scattered patches of sentences founding contrary to their iudgments, to deceaue the simple, and to draw them into error? Are you men appointed to be leaders of the blinde, and doe you willingly digge pitts for them? The Lord deliuer his people from such pastors which stop their mouthes with grauel instead of bread, and kill them with the poyson of their owne erroneous concepts, instead of feeding them with the wholesome foode of God his truth. My purpose is not to enter any particuler examination of your allegations. For euen as one when he was inioyned to carry away a dunghill, after he considered how huge and foule it was, neuer put to his shoulders, but opened a passage to a riuer not far off, by the flowing wherof he swept it away: So I, when I perceaued how wearisome and vnprofitable it would

would be to ranck to the bottom this heape of trumpery, thinke it better, rather then to remoue all this baggage, in traid of water to put her to it, which happely might make some speedy, riddance of such stuff, and thus ended for this Dialogue.

A Survey of the Seauenth Dialogue.

In this Dialogue of *common experience*, Whether *Actuall Possession of Spirits may be* or no, I expected some prooue that the possessions mentioned by *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Cicero*, *Josephus*, and to all our owne times, were all but counterfeyt, and therefore no reason to thinke any other of *Soulers* at *Nottingham*. But as apothecaries boxes carry titles of *Alloes*, *Syrax*, *Benjoin*, and within haue nothing but black leade, copporas, Ucker, and such trash: so heere we haue a title of *common experience*, without any experience at all, not any one approoued example once cited and conuicted. Yet to examine such as you bring: first you will proue *Actuall Possession cannot be*, because a great or greater workes are done by nature, Art, & Sicknesse. Surely this cannon makes a foule battery, not onely overthrowing this possession at *Nottingham*, but all other elsiwhere in the world, yea those that are mentioned in the scripture. It be-hooues vs therefore to fortify what we can against so daungerous a shot, or else all is like to goe to ruine. What then are the workes of nature? Diuers are reckoned out of *Pliny*, *Strabo*, and others, whereby you would conclude, that if the boy at *Magnitton* had breathed out flames of fier, it had bene no worke of actuall possession, because *Actu* doth so: If he had bene able to draw yon vnto him, in so much that if your selues had come in place, because your faces are of this mettall you should haue iowled foreheads with him: yet this had bene no wonder, because the *Magnes* doth so: If by his embracing one *A. Walker* he should so violently haue detayned him, that he could not possibly make one step forward towards *Ireland*, this had bene no maruaile at all, because the little fish *Echneis* is able to stay a ship of great burthen neuer so fleet vnder sayle. Why, you *Discourgers*, things are not maruelous, except to the ignorant, whē they worke according to kinde: but when they goe beyond their naturall abillity, though the actions be not comparable to others in nature, they are wonderfull. It is no strange thing for the Sonne to lighten the whole opposite face of the earth, and yet if *Moses* face shine, the people are afraid. You remember our of *Augustine* other

page: 202.

page: 202
Aug. in ciuit.
in 24. ca. 23

workes of nature very strange done by men. But what of them I pray you? Were *Somers* actions also naturall? Naturall actions shew themselues from the cradle, to the graue: whereas *Somers* before the time of his first vexation by *Sathan* could neuer doe any of the. But you will say, that which is done naturally by one, by art and practise may be done by another. It would be hard for you to proue that those workes which *Augustine* mentioneth, could be imitated by any art. though I confesse strange things may be done by colening and practise, as *Eusebius* and *Chrysostome* doe both teach: notwithstanding they both acknowledg Actuall possession, which easely may be discerned from artificiall workings. for in these be teachers, long exercise, some end of glory or gaine, with diuers other circumstances, whereas the possessed respect neither profit nor credit, but fall into strange passions in a moment without schoole-maisters, or any former exercise. The Pharisees were wiser then to vse this silly shift to discredit our Sauiour his miracles by: which was ready at hand, if it had bene of any force. Further say you, *stranger actions often arise from meere naturall diseases*. It is true, but because you shew not these things in *Somers* to haue proceeded from naturall disease, you abuse your Reader with idle wordes. It might be apparant to you they came not from disease, for that he was deliuered from his vexation in a moment, without any ordinary meanes of phisick, as likewise *Darling* of *Burton* was, and the seauen in *Lancashire*. Moreover, if their strange effects came from some naturall disease, then did they not counterfeyt. If they counterfeited, then had they no disease, but were in good health I trust. Reconcile thes together I pray you: and if you will contend still for counterfeiting, giue ouer your prating of *naturall diseases* for shame.

Secondly you reason from the naturall power of the Diuel, that he cannot effect such things as are reported to be done by *Somers*, & therefore there was no actuall possession. And wherefore coulde he not effect such things? Because say you the diuel cannot doe workes vnpossible in nature. Heere we must demaund of you what you meane by workes impossible in nature: whether impossible to the nature of a diuell, and nature generally, or impossible to the nature of the man, in whome he worketh. In the former sence, we know the Diuell hath a restraint: in the second, he may inable a man to breake chaynes, which by his owne naturall strength he cannot possibly doe, & that is as vnpossible to be done by man, as any of the things we report by *Somers*. Now whether of these two meanings doe you follow?

Euseb: de pr.
Euang. lib. 4:
cap: 1
Chry. ad po-
pul. Antioch.
hom: 20

pag, 206.

page, 208.

Marke 5, 4

A SURVEY OF

51

followe forsooth both: In the *Major* the first, and in the *Minor* the second. Therefore I answer you, because you shoote in a bow with two strings, I will stand out of your way, as most perillous archers, able to kill the man in the moone. Againe, say you, in all sound Divinity there is an impossibility of such actions, because the Diuel is no Creator of substances, no trans-former of natures, no worker of miracles. If you would haue distinguished your tearmes, and then haue spēt some wordes to make plaine, that in these actions there was such a creation, such a transformation, such a miraculous working, as coulde not be incident to the power of the diuel, I would haue shaped you an answer if I could: but because you make a confused noyse, as if you were ringing of bees, you shall swarme them vpon what bough you will for all me: Nay but say you, if the diuel did such things, once, he can doe them againe. It may be he can, and would too, if he were at any mans commaund like an ape to shew tricks. It may be also that sometimes he doth them, though all the world heare not thereof. That which you bring of his being too weak an Agent, for that he is not Omnipotent, as if an Omnipotence were required in these actions, is miserable beggery, still craving that which will not begratified you. If you will not be answered, you would like importunate beggars be set in the stocks. Touching the ap-petite you deny to be in the young man at Mahometton to those supernaturall actions, I answer, There is little appetite in a stone, or in a man to fly aloft in the air, yet violence doth make them doethat, vnto which they be not naturally fit. But what are those actions which could not and haue not bene wrought by spirits in mens bodies? Hattie you forgotten how you would make vs beleue, that greater workes then any was done in *Somers*, are vsually done by nature, by art, by sickness? Are mens bodies not capable of such workes of Sathan, as praeface, distease, or nature effecteth in them? For your application of matter & forme we haue spoken sufficiently in the question of assuming bodies. Surely your faculty in logick is exceeding great, which contrary to the iudgment of sence in proper obiects, and other things requisite rightly disposed, will force reason to a Non plus. O that you had liued in those daies, when they disputed whether Snow is white. No doubt by your good helpe the *Academicks* had preuailed, whatsoeuer sence saith. But still you urge the matter further: by Divinity, Philosophy, Physick, Law, Conscience. If Divinity the *Mistres* condēne these actions, you might wel haue spared the other five her hand-maides. But you are like new wine runned vp in vessels, you must

page 209.

pag 210

pag 211

pag, 211, & 212.

either vent, or burst. What then saith Divinity? *working of miracles is ceased long since.* But the things wrought in *Somers* by the diuell were miracles, or else you say vntruly. If you be such vnreasonable beggars, that no answer will serue you, you woulde be cudgelled from the dore. For the handmaids I will not talke with them: their Mistresse hath receaued answer for all. Lastly to auoyd need elsse speach, I will not graunt you, neither shall you euer be able to wrig from me, That *diuels* can bring to passe such things as their pleasure, or if they wrought these actions in *Somers*, that therefore they can stop the ordinary course of all other naturall actions, and ordinances appointed by God. You were sick of a feuer, when you tyed these consequences together. The Diuels power is a limyted power. He can not touch one haire of our heades further then his commission serueth him. Thus much for the diuels power.

Page 213.

Page 214.

Thirdly you reason from the distribution of actions, & causes of right iudgment. If (say you) these actions in *Somers* were true actions, then were they either naturall, or not naturall: and then either against nature, or besides nature, or aboue nature, to be discerned also by some rule of truth, which either nature affordeth (by inbred principles Theoricall, & practicall, or got by experience of sence, of History, of Induction, or of our owne Tryall) or else at least is supernaturallly giuen vs: but none of all these were to be seene in *Somers* actions, and therefore no true actions. I answer, there was to be seene in him Actions against nature, as when he went about to hang himselfe, though you fondly imagine it was no such action, because it was not effected: there were actions in him besides nature, when his face and mouth were monstrously distorted, one lip towarde one eare, and the other towards the other: there were actions aboue nature, in his strength, in his knowledg, in his sundry passions, as of a lump about as big as an egge mouing along his legg, belly, throat, and other partes. so that this portion of your prooffe is patched vp altogether with vntruthes. Now for your rule of iudgement, you affirme, these actions of *Somers* could not be iudged by any Theoricall and Practicall principles. Your reason is, because Theoricall and Practicall principles be only naturall, and *Somers* actions were supernaturall. Surely this might be the reason also of meere Naturalls. As if *Rectum* is not *Iudex sui et obliqui*. If naturall principles iudge what is accordinge to nature, the same principles shall also iudge what is aboue nature. Doe you thinke heathen Philosophers were not able to discern what worke was supernaturall? Was Aristotle a foole in writing *Metaphisicks*? But what of Experience?

Page 215.

rience? It is not *uniuersall* (say you) because *diuers amongst you where the thing was done, did not acknowledge such experimented tryalls of an actuall possession*. Indeed the Pharises if it could haue bene brought to passe, by no meanes would haue had the blinde mans eyes opened by our Sauour Christ. And in *Nottingham* it was apparant that Papisme, prophane life, & anger for hauing some of their frendes touched, caused some to oppose themselues. Then for the *seuerall degrees of experience*, It could not (say you) be determined by sence, because the *obiects of sence were deceauable*. I answer, you say vntruly: The *obiects of sence were true obiects*. For sence apprehendeth but the outward appearance, which semblance is true, though the inward substance be not that, which outward likenesse sheweth to be. Hath not the Lord set his bow in the clowdes, though it be but an appearance onely to sence through the repercussion of the sunne beames, in a subiect fitly disposed, and that there is no such thing existing really indeede. Doe not spirits appeare to men, though the bodies they seeme to haue, oft be no true bodies, but onely carry the similitude and image of them? your other partes of *experience* be ydle, for *History and Induction* could haue no place in one present *Individuum*, and *Triall* which consisteth in prooffe of action, might happily be in *Somers* himselfe, but not in the behoulders. These actions then haue store of naturall prooffe, howsoeuer your eyes dimmed through enuy or couetousnes and desire of preferment, cannot behold it.

page 328.

After you come to your *Supernaturall rule*, from whence you would conclude, *There is at this day no actuall possession*, because *S. Paul* hauing shewed the *Ephesians* the whole counsaile of God, giues neither *Canon nor Counsell of Actuall Possessions*. It is vntrue, that you say. For as in visiting of the sick, and diuers other such christian duties, there is nothing expressly set downe, but is onely to be gathered by implication & sound deduction, so likewise in this of *possession*: Concerning which he hath generally admonished vs, *To put on the whole armour of God*. In which wordes he comprehendeth all vexation of *Sathan* whatsoever, and sheweth also in the words following the remedy. Except you can make good vnto vs, that possession is none of the Engines to ouerthrow man withall. VWhereas you require some precept of this matter to *Timothew & Titus*, you are to vnderstand that the ordinary giuft is not peculiar to the Minister, but common to all beleeuers. And therefore no maruaile if there be no *Speciall precept of this*, more then of visiting the sycke,

page 329.
108. 20. 37.

Ephes 6:12

redeeminge

redeming captiues, releeuing decayed persons, and such like: in which duties all Christians haue interest, and not onely the Ministers. Again you say, that if *perpetuity of Actuall possession* be either expressly, or implicatiuely coneyned in the word, then also the miraculous faith is either expressly or implicatiuely coneyned in the word: which is stark false, as you and your fellowes haue bene told an hundred times, considering miraculous faith is not necessarily required for dispossession, as (God willing) shall be shewed more at large in the ninth dialogue. Thus then haue these men reasoned against *experience*, and haue afforded vs three generall arguments to disprove all *Possessions* by, & as well all as that of *Nottingham*.

But seeing they haue talked to no purpose of *Experience*, I will in one word commend to the Christian Reader these Experiences following, besides those mentioned in the *Doctrine*, for his better satisfaction in this point. And first of the possessed woman of whose *Firmitianns* doth treat at large in his Epistle to Cyprian: an exaple out of the compasse of that time, wherewith these *Discourssers* would bound all *Actuall* possession. But what neede I stand vpon former times? If possession be apparant in these our daies, it must needes be that neither hath it cealed in ages past. To come then to our own times, & with one bush to stop two gappes. Examples we haue in our owne country, as in *Margaret Harrison* of *Burnham Wlpe* within the county of *Norfolk*, in *Kath. Wright*, in *M. Throckmorsons* children, *Tb. Darling* of *Burton*, the leauen in *Lancashire*, *Iane Iorden* the seruant of *Symon Fox* of *Shadbrook* in *Susfolk*, whose cause was hearde before the *Right Ho: the L. Cheif Iustice* of England at *S. Edmondebury* the 12. of Iuly 1599. *Ioane Nayler* as was proued before the *Right Ho: the L. Anderson* Novem. 30 the same yeare. *Susan Bryson* of *Saffron Walden* in *Essex*, as is plaine by the euidence giuen against *Alice Bentley* at the Quarter Sessions holden at the afore-said *Walden* the 13. day of April 1602. which *Susaa* was lately dispossessed, the meanes being ved which God hath to that end appointed. Also in *Tho. Harrison* of *North Wych* in *Cheshire*, & in *Clemens Charles* a maid of *Woolroytch* commonly called *Wullage* in *Kent*: both which be at this present very greiuously vexed by *Sathan*, so as he that will may be an eye witnesse thereof. Out of our owne country, as at *Spandaw* a towne sixe miles from *Brandenburgh* in *Germany* in the yeare (as I take it) 1594. the diuel did walke visibly, and possessed more then twenty men, vexing them in miserable sort. Yea he scattered in the publike streetes morfy, boxes, gold & siluer

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

35

& silver buttons, and such like: and he that gathered any of these things was presently vexed by the diuel. Whereupon it was forbidden both in the schooles & churches, that none should take vp any such scattered things. The like were done by wicked spirits at *Berlin* in the same *Marquisship* of *Brandenburg*: And at *Fridberge* a towne of the new *Marchia*, there were more then an hundred and fifty men, of either sex, condition, & age, which were possessed with wicked spirits. These things are testified by *D. Iames Coler* Provoost in *Berlin*, and *M. Robert Coler*, and *M. Iames Pretor* Pastors of the Church in *Spandavia*. To whose Narration *Balthasar Westphalus*, and *Iohn Muller* Consuls of *Spandaw* haue subscribed. *Iohn Fernelius* a man worthy to be credited for his famous learning, place, and deserved authority, throughout all Christendome: reporteth of two possessed, one taken in the night, when as by occasion of immoderate thirst he rising out of his sleepe, and finding no drinke, bit of an apple that he hit on by chance, wherewith presently he perceaued his iawes to be shut, & as it were strangled with ones hand, & with all, he being now possessed of a diuel entring into him, did seeme to behould himselfe in the dark to be deuoured by a mighty black dog which things saith he, afterwards when he was restored to his perfect minde, he reported to vs in order. The other was a Knight his sonne, taken in such Tort, that sometimes his left arme, sometimes his right, sometimes one finger, one whiles one thigh, one other a hile both, sometimes the whole body was greuously vexed: which torment passed with so great swiftnes, & shaked him so vehemently; that hardly foure seruants could hold him in his bed. The most skilfull phisitions iudged it a conuulsion, hauing next affinity with the Epilepsy, and so accordingly directed their practise, but without any successe at all. The reason was (saith he) for that we were all deceaued in the true iudgment of the Cause. For in the third moneth a wicked spirit was found to be the author of all the euil, be trayning himselfe by a voice, and vnwonted words & sentences both Latine and Greeke although the sick party was ignorant of the Greeke tongue. He discovered many secrets of them that fate by, and especially of the Phisitions, laughing that he had deceaued them in a matter of so great perill, and that they had almost killed that poore body with their unprofitable medecynes. These examples alleaged giue vs euident prooofe of possessions in these daies. Now let the Reader choose whether he will beleue these testimonies and experiences, or the vnlaundry and vnlearned

de Abdieneri
caus. lib. 2. ca.
16:

page 33. 6.

disputations of these *Discourfers*.Cypri. ad De
metri.
De oper. lib.
4. cap. 10.

Hitherto of *Possession*, now they turne themselves to *Obsession*, vnkilfully opposed, as hath bene partly shewed, to *Possession*. For they which treat of these matters vie these wordes indifferently. *Cyprian* saith, *And by the torments of wordes they are cast forth of Obsessed bodyes*. So *Fernelius* in the place before cited, *And withall be being now obsessed by the diuel entering into him*. Likewise *Laurentius* (as before we heare) speaking of diuels (substantially entering into bodyes, calles it by the name of being *Obsessed by diuels*. And moue *Obsidere* doth not onely signifie to besiege, and to compass about, but also *Tenere*, *Occupare*, *Opprimere*, to *Hold*, *Possesse*, & *Oppress*, as when *Culpy* saith, *Cum is qui audit ab Oratore iam obsessus est ac tenetur*: When the bearer is now possessed and held by the Oratour. And it seemeth that writers rather vie the word *Obsessed* then *Possessed* partly for comfort of the afflicted, teaching them they are not absolutely in the diuels power, howsoeuer he thus furiously rageth in their bodies, but rather that he now seeketh to vanquish them, then that without all hope they be vanquished already: partly also for the better sound, These *Discourfers* in a private vnderstanding make *Obsession* nothing else but an outward assault of *Sathan*, which onely power they leaue vnto him now. And where it is objected, This doth open a dore to *Athiesme*, they returne this imputation very wisely vpon the doctrine of possession: as if to teach both inward and outward vexation were a doctrine of more security, then theirs of outward temptation onely. It had wont to be an old laid saw in *Geomitry*, *the part is lesse then the whole*: but these men will refine all *Artes*, & teach vs a new, That the part is more then the whole. And so let this memorable *Answer* shut vp this dialogue.

A Survey of the Eight Dialogue.

page 34. 1

Hauiſg bewrayed your great ignorance concerning the power of *Sathan*, you come to talke how this power is to be subdued: where in you shew your selues as blinde, if not also obstinate and peruerse, as you haue in that already passed. Much lauish speech is in the beginning, wherewith I will neither trouble my selfe, nor the Reader. Onely we may noate by the way, how vntruly you require for the subduing of a *huall possession* an extraordinary power: concerning which we shall see in that which followeth. Then you sling out, as youre custome is, against the worke at *Nottingham*, because (say you)

Cryinge

Coming aloud, vnderstanding, & leaving, as shall be made vndoubted true page, 34 b.
signes of that dispossession: whereas the same things are seene in Mania,
(and sometimes a Mania without them as in your letters) in Phren-
sies, in the Maiber, in Conuulsions &c. I answer, I neither make these
the onely, nor the necessary signes of dispossession: for I know di-
uers haue bene wrought without them: but I frame my reason thus,
Where these signes be, & a present deliuerance doth follow from those &
former vexations by Saubon, vpon the request of God his people, that
there is a dispossession. I entelle these signes particularly may be in
diuers diseases, but they are not from the diuel: neither is there a
present restoring of the parties diseased in naturall sickness vpon the
vving of earnest prayer.

I hose meanes for dispossession which you stand vpon, I allow page, 34 c.
not. They be not Rings, Routes, nor Hearbes, that be of any auayle
in this worke. Neither doe we vrge the sibes liuer nor Davids harp,
nor the musick wherewith Elshas spirit was calmed: and therefore all
this as superfluous talke, nothing pertyninge to this cause I omit.
But we cleaue onely to God his owne ordinance of prayer, holpen
forward by the Exercise of fasting, which according to his gratus
promise & mercy we haue proued to be effectuell. Against which,
before you encounter with your full strength, you sporte your
selues with a prophane scoffing in the end of this dialogue. And fir- in page, 36 b.
st, you wil needes wring from me whether I wil or no, that the
worke done at Nottingham, was done onely by fasting. You are able to
wring Hercules his club out of his fist. You haue proued your selues
such exceeding sharp Logicians in the former Discourses, that I stand
in great feare of you: yet now I must endure the brunt of it, come
what wil. Go to then, bring forth your wringer. This then is it, That
which made the prayer more forcible, & the spirit more apt, was the apt page 357. 35 B
efficient cause of the supposed action. But your fasting made your prayer
more forcible &c. & the effort was the efficient cause of the action. This
is a wringer indeede. If Cardane were aliue he would register this
Practicall Theoreme in the booke of his Subtilties. What a profit
would this proposition well vnderstood, bring to many artificers?
It would ease them of great expence in prouiding many tooles. The
Carpenter might spare his axe and chisels, and goe to sell timber,
square logges, and doe his other workes with his onely whetstone.
For that which makes the axe and chisell more forcible is the onely
efficient of the worke. And so by this vnanswerable reason I am
made a Monianist, a Papist, & one that makes fasting a sufficient meane page, 357. B.
in it selfe

in it selfe, for suppressing of all suggested *acti*all finnes whatsoeuer: which opinion though I am far from, yet if you will follow my counsaile *M. Deacon*, for some things that I know, you should fast more then you doe. Again you are instant to know, If prayer be a *meanes*, in what order of *meanes* I woulde place it. Not in that sure which you foolishly fancy to your selues, For what childe would esteeme of praiser as a *meere naturall action*? But this is futeable to your other blinde ignorances. Further you argue, that prayer can be no *meanes*, whether we respect the *Sound*, the *Wayce*, or the *wordes*: wherein you shew your selues no lesse voyd of piety, then you haue bene hither to of wit and learning. Can you not be content to reproch me, but you must needes open your mouthes against the holy worship of God? Can you finde no other causes wherefore prayer shoulde be effectiual, but onely for a *wise shalke made*, or for some distinct voice, or also for certaine *charming words*? In which of these respects consisteth the power of ordinarie prayer? you must needes answer, It consisteth in none of them: Conclude then, that ordinarie praiser is but lip labour. Your sudationnes is intollerable: In this 260. page you carry your selues more like *Athiests*, then *Preachers*. It is a shaid your booke was not better examined before it was allowed to the presse. But thus having brandished your sword about your eares, you make an end of this foolish talke, and prepare your selues to other as good.

page 259.

page, 260

A Survey of the Ninth Dialogue.

This Dialogue aymes at two poynts. That *Prayer & fasting* be not established by *Christ*, as a *perpetuall ordinary meanes* for powerfull expelling of *duels*: That *lust* yme faith apprehending some *super-naturall power of God*, doth not effect that worke. For the first, the Reader must take heede, he vnderstand not prayer and fasting, as I meane it, and we all usually doe, for an effectiuall ordinance of God to quicken faith by, which is our onely apprehender of God his mercies, in these and all other actions, but for a bare and meere naked performance of these workes of *Fasting & Prayer*: For so these *Triflers* expound themselves, some *liue*ne leaves after, which disputation might haue had some vie against *Papists*, that mainteine their *Opus operatum*, an efficacy of the worke done, for the onely workes sake: but in what stead can it se iue against me? It may be they intended it against *Papists*, these *Discomf*ers propoun-

pag: 263

page: 292.

ding to themselves the generall doctrine of Spirits: but neither doe their arguments presse them at all, & besides they apply their whole course of speech against that done at Nottingham. So then they dispute against me in words, but not indeede, thereby labouring to deceiue the Reader, not able, as they thought, to distinguish betweene these two. If you had ment plainly, you would haue shewed in what sence you had dealt in this place: but it was shamerfull to expresse as, for so you should haue appeared to all worthy to be hissed at. And therefore you deferred your explication til some thirty pages after, where no man would looke for it, that in the meane season you might seeme to be talking, and yet at last haue a runninge knot on your iugling stick, to play fast and loose with at your pleasure. Should any man bestow time against persons of such peruerse trade, that are corrupted in their mindes, and are deprived of the truth? I assure thee good Reader, every lyne seemes a page vnto me, yet least thou shouldst be deceaued by these Hucksters dealing, I put my self to these paines. We then to come to the first point, If you can say any thing; wherefore *fasting and prayer accompanied with true fasting saith is not a perpetual meanes ordryed by Christ for exorcising of diuels* let vs heare what it is.

1 Tim. 4.8

There is no commaundment (say you) or canons any where exs^t as page 164
in all the Scriptures for the application of it.

Because it seemes you haue bene seeking and can finde none, I will shew you some. Our Saviour teaching vs to pray, *And leade vs not into temptation but deliver vs fr^m euill*, doth therein teach vs to pray against actuall possession. It was an euil you confesse, where with many in his time and after were troubled. Neither may we thinke the forme given by our Saviour, is any thing defectiue, as if some part of our necessity were omitted. If then praier be a meanes to defend and preserue from a tuall possession, it is also a meanes to deliuer from the same; if at any time we be euertaken with it. And seeing also possession is still remaining in the church, as hath beene proued by vnanswerable arguments, it must needes be also, the remedy of praier is stil remaining. and warranted from hence. Again, *This kinde goeth not forth (saith he) but by fasting and praier*: Math. 17.21. To this place you answer, That our Saviour *onely makes knowne the impediment in that action, but puts downe no commaundment*. And here you condemne me of grosse ignorance that could not see this. I contrariwise admire your superabundant skill, that is able to make two things iustle out one another without any opposition.

page 164

pray your great learning teach me (for of my selfe I can not conceaue) How the presence of that thing should not be a meane, an helpe, a furtherance, the absence whereof is a let, an hindrance, an impediment. Or how a defect can be reprov'd, but that a supply of the same defect should withall be commaunded. And how an euill can be perpetuall, as I haue shewed a tuall possession is; & that the remedy should not alio be perpetuall, considering the Lord is more ample in mercy towards vs, then in iustice: Hee chides, if neither we are to haue any vse of fasting and prayer in the eactions; nor the Apostles euer vse them in casting out diuels (at least we neuer read that they did) how might the Church reape profit of this instruction? Did our Saviour giue precepts, that were vaine and superfluous? Or was this instruction proper to that one act in and neuer to come in vie after wards? I beseech you make not dimity of your skill, but lighten my ignorance in these points.

page 265

Moreouer, whereas you require *some testimony for this ordinance in Paul his epistles*, and for want of such doe therevpon conclude that *there is no such ordinance*. I answer, it is not necessary we should proue this ordinance out of the epistles of S. Paul. May not warrant for it out of the gospel suffice? And *canons & rules* thence for our direction therein? If you can proue that all the ordinances of God whatsoever, be conteyned in *Pauls epistles*: I will eyther from thence proue this ordinance, or confesse that there is no such ordinance. Yet notwithstanding know ye, that where the Apostle speaking of the compleat armour of Christians against the diuel, requireth that we *pray with all manner of prayer and supplication in the spirit*, that from thence this ordinance hath confirmation. Let this then be a third place. And where you adde that *the Apostles in the epistles to Timothy and Titus handles at large all Church officers and officers*, I haue already shewed that expelling of diuels is no peculiar duty of any Church officer: and therefore you haue no reason to looke for this precept amongst the aduertisements of their charge.

Epho 6:18.

Againe you object S. Peter that *laying on the perpetuall vnceries of Sathan to kill & deuour, he maketh no mention of prayer & fasting, but only of a strong faith*. I answer, The reason of this was, because S. Peter was not aware of that variance betwene faith & prayer, which your Eagle eyes haue elpyed: who as it seemeth can haue a faith without prayer, and prayer without faith. He thought simply as he had learned, that where he spake of faith, men would also haue vnderstood all the helpes and furtherances of faith, & not by the name

the name of faith destroy whatloever might giue maintenance to it. But because you stand so strictly vpon the word *prayer*, take this for a fourth place, Is any among you afflicted? let him pray: Shall we thinke that possession is no affliction? Or that in this affliction onely we are barred from praier? Or if we doe pray, that it shall be to no effect. Now then you may see, that you casting your net, and for all your dragginge findinge nothing in all the canonically scripture for this ordinance, it was not for want of stoare, whereof I haue giuen you but a tast that you drew vp empty to land, but because you had so many floters in the top, and wanted leade to sinke it a conuenient depth.

James 5, 13

VWhereas therefore you chalenge me for proofes of this institution, these places may suffice for authority of scriptures. And might not those testimonies of antiquity, and of present practise with the godly now a²aies content you, which I haue alleadged in the *Doctrin*, but that you must blazon me for a *Braver* in wordes, which neither had brought any thing to purpose, nor possibly could bring. Say you. we wonder you blush not to braue out the matter, by pretending the authority of Scriptures, the testimony of fathers olde and new, the practise of the church, and the good successe thereof, to mannage the matter it selfe. I beseech thee good Reader let me by thy patience remember some part of that already set downe in the *Doctrin*, wherebv thou maist better behould these mens vn honest dealings, and whether I meereelv pretend these things as they tell thee. First therefore I haue cited *Origen*, speaking to this effect: If at any time wee shall deale about the curing of the possessed, we (continuing in prayer & fasting) may obteyne helpe from God for them: & shall drine forth the wicked spirit by fasting and prayer. Next *Tertullian*, who saith, We expell diuels out of men, as is knowne to many. Then *Cyprian*, saying, diuels are by vs cast out of bodies possessed. Fourthly *Chrysostome*, out of whose testimony there cited at large, these wordes be part: So the fathers haue appointed, that men vexed by the diuel shoulde be brought forth, that the people and all the citie being present, publique prayers might be made for th'm, that all with one accord might intreat the Lord in their behalf, and might shew with strong cryes that the Lord would haue mercy vpon th'm &c. Fifthly *Peter Martyr*, concerning men possessed, vsing these wordes We wil vse for them faithfull prayers, I say, Peter Martes prayers most reherment, & supplications for their recovery: In a word, this should be the most laudible & wise course, that exorcismes at this day be turned into prayers. Sixtly, *Chemnisius*, who That in the time of *Chrysostome*

page, 265.

page, 55.

Orig. in mat. 17, 21.

Tertul in apo log: & ad Scapul. cap. 3.

Cyprian ad Demetri.

Chrysostom 50. de incompre. Dei nature ra homil 38

Peter Martes 92. 4, cap. 92.

sect. 13.

chemnis de sacra ordinis

Chrysostome

Christome and Prosper the possessed were brought into the Church, and were oft delivered by the common supplications of the assembly. Seauenthly, Philip Melancthon making mention of diuers which were possessed, and namely of a damsel in Mantua, that had bene healed of that disease by the prayers of the godly, of whome he saith, Et adhuc viuente sana, and yet she liueth and continueth sound: which was 17. yeares after the cure Vling further these wordes, Neither indeede doe I doubt but that euil may be taken away, and the diuels expelled by the prayer of the godly. And a few lynes after, I know many examples a herein it is certaine the prayers of the godly preuailed. Eightly Theord. Beza, writing thus, I know a certaine boumboulder in France indued with the knowledge of the gospel, and which had embraced the same: who when in anger he had giuen one of his children to the diuils he had his sonne presently possessed of the diuel: out of whome after he was cast by the seruent and vncessant prayers of the church. Nynthly Vogellius affirming that for casting out of diuels, there is not a better and more godly way at this day, then that Christ sitting at the right hand of the father, be called vpon, not onely by the kniue of the possessed, but also of the whole church, with a seruent hart & be put in minde of his omnipotency & mercy, whereby onely at this day, the vncleane spirits are cast forth. Tenthly Dancens saying, wherefore by fasting and prayer (which be that prayeth doth) diuels may be cast forth that is: with the loue continual, & seruent prayers of the possessed man, and also the church, as are these which are signed with fasting &c. Lastly Chassanin auouching thus, This onely remedie remaineth to vs, whereby we ought to helpe these kinde of men (viz. possessed) worthy of commiseration, to wit that with seruent prayers we pray for their deliurance. So I heard that a Dimack was deliuered in a certaine towne within the Dolphyn prouince. These testimonies haue I alleadged in the Doctrine: and vnto these can adioyne more. But to what purpose, these remaining vnanswere? Now then you Discouersers, whereas I affirmed, that both the auncient Doctors, & the lights of our owne time did witnesse with me in this point, was this nothing but a Thraasonicall vaunt, as you tearme it? Or huge bragging barrells, that would neuer be set on broache? and praises that did haue in calamie, cleane so close to the pen, that they could procure no publique passage? Are most plaine and euident testimonies of truth to be shifted of in this manner? you are like the malefactors which knowing themselves sure to be cast by the Iury. refuse the ordinarie tryall by God & the countrv, and will be tryed by no other meanes but by God and the Conscience: So you in a desperate case would fayne

Phil. Melanct.
lib. epistol

Beza homil.
26. in histori.
pass edit 2.
page 656.

Vogell in
thesaur theol
log. 2. ag. 980

Dancquest 38
in Marc.

Chass in loc.
com. lib. 1
cap. 17

page, 166:

gaine some time and dailly of the verdict ready to condemne you, by requiring some other course, which you thinke is not present. To the end therefore your notorions impudency may be had in remembrance, let there be a publike instrument drawne to this effect.

Be it knowen vnto all men by these presents, that *Iohy Deacon* and *Iohn Walker*, vnworthely reputed Ministers, hauing had the cleare euidence of truth passed against them, and being neither able to answer one word, nor induring to submit themselves thereunto, as they ought, are two shamelesse beastes, which with branded consciences, and whorish forheades, haue soulded them selues to face cut a lye, to deceive the simple with. In witness whereof all the learned of this land, which shal consider the allegations against you, and your paltry answers, will in consent of mindes subscribe to these presentes, that they are true. Let this then suffice for the prooffe of that I haue brought, and so I will proceede to examine yours.

You cite *M. Calvin* against actuall fasting alone, as an effectually counterpoysen for the expelling of Sathan, as it is mainteyned by the Papists. What is this to me you *Discoffers*? Haue I any where said it, or shewed it by practise, that the very worke of fasting and prayer without faith is sufficient in this businesse? Or doth *M. Calvin* speake against fasting and prayer being ioyned with faith? What impudent men are these that dare offer such a thing so palpable to the view of the world? The hare is neere driuen that is faine for refuge to run betwene the hunters leggs, and your case is desperate, that seekes releife at such a testimonie. Then you cite *M. Bullinger* as if he also should say, that *prayer & fasting is not here prescribed as a perpetuall canon*. I graunt as *M. Bullinger* vnderstandeth it, that is, *It is not prescribed as a perpetuall canon to exorcists*. Our sauour doth not here institute a new office in the Church, but this makes nothinge against the common duty of christians, that they in their assemblies whether greater or lesse, should vse prayer & fasting in this behalf. So likewise *D. Fulk* is to be vnderstood, out of whome you cannot shew one sillable against these holy exercises of the congregation, but as they are appropriated to the persons of *Exorcists*. page 116

After this dispute you fall a jangling against me, condemning me as a *busie bodie for intermeddling in this action at Nottingham*. But you might vnderstand if malice would let you, that I pressed not into this businesse, but was drawne into it. I tooke vpon me no fa- page 167.

cuttie about others, but was willinge after much intreaty to ioyne with my bretheren in so charitable a worke: I disordered no ecclesiasticall gouernment of our Church, but being allowed a Minister of the Gospell, I did no more then my place would warrant. What meane you then vpon this occasiō to let flie at Christ his sacred discipline? Is the disgracing of his ordinance that which mult win you your spurs? I know the shadow of discipline is terrible vnto you.

See pag 170.

But it were happy for you, if you might tast of her seueritie, that you might escape his, which accounts not mans negligence, & his winking at our crimes for payment. I will not preile you further this way. The Lord giue you hearts of fleih, that the works of fleih being destroyed in you, your soules & bodies may be safe in the day of his iudgment.

pag 171

Whereas you cauill against prayer and fasting, that it is no meanes to expel Sathan, *because the effect doth not presently follow: what ignorance or proud presumption is this, when the Lord himselfe praeth, Not my will, but thine: be done, the seruant shouldest absolutely and presently exact the thing he craues, without respect of the lord his pleasure at all? When thou askest (saith Basil) that which is meete to aske at the Lord his hands, cease not till thou hast receaued it: perhaps for that cause begins theore presently, that he may teach thee perseuerance, and that thou maist learne what the guift of God is, and when it is giuen thee thou maist keepe it with feare.* Hither to goeth the prooffe of the first generall argument against prayer and fasting.

de vita solit.
cap. 3

page, 174:

The second is, *That prayer & fasting haue no power proceedinge from them, as praier is either vocall, or personall, & that whether we respect the natural guift, or supernaturall, this being also either principall or instrumentall, and therefore prayer & fasting haue no power at all.* For prooffe of the assumption we haue a long discourse of six or seauenteen auies to no purpose, but onely to spend time, of the cause of miraculous operations, a thinge knowne to all, but entred into Diuinity, and I thanke the lord not doubted of by me. To let goe therefore all your needelesse talke, I answer breisly, that the power proceedinge from our praiers was personall, (if you take personall as you ought, and as learned men doe for an acceptation of our persons, and not for the principall inherency of this power in our persons) not of my selfe onely, but of all his faithfull people then assembled together, accepted by god the father in the person of Iesus Christ. Secondly that this personall power was supernaturall, depending onely vpon god his institution, and promise made to praier,

not

not vpon any naturall efficacy whatſoeuer. Thirdly that this power was instrumentall, not principall. Fourthly that you moſt abſurdu conclude of the premiſes. I hat becauſe this power is intru mental, therefore it is not perſonal: which both may ſtand together, and doe in all the children of god. But if you will take perſonal according to a peculiar fancie of your owne brayne, for a primary being of this power in our perſons, then is your firſt diſtroubtion chid diu, not comprehending all the kindes of power, and ſo what ſoeuer is built therevpon not worth a ruſh. But is not this a worthy argument thinke you, which would as well ouerthrow all efficacy of prayer whatſoeuer as that action at Nottingham? Surely you diſpute as if you were Atheiſts. For admit all power of praier ſhould be either vocall or perſonall, and that it is effectual by neither meanes, it muſt needes bee it ſhould haue no effect at all. O intolerable impietie

Like truſſe it is when you oppoſe the power of God, and the meanes, whereas both vſually concur in all actions. You goe on, and will diſproue, that *prayer and faſting is not a meanes of apprehending the ſupernatural power of God.* But ſpare your labour: who hath affirmed it? I know no meanes of apprehending either his power, or other his graces, but onely faith. It you can diſproue that this hand layeth not hold vpon the power of God, ſtrengthned by his promiſe, what ſoeuer ye aſke the Father in my name, that he will giue vnto you, pro-

ceede on I pray you. Thus then you ſay, *That this promiſe conſiſteth not an absolute warrant for euery extraordinary enterpriſe:* And herein I accord with you, I hat only thoſe things are aſked in the name of Chriſt, which are aſked according to the will of God, for his ſonne's ſake. But it is, according to his will, that in all vexations of Sathan wee ſhould call vpon him for helpe in the mediation of his ſonne.

Call vpon me, ſaith he, *in the day of thy trouble, and I will heare thee.* And our Sauour teacheth vs to pray, *But deliuer vs from euill.* Wherevpon, if it had pleaſed you, you might haue eaſily leene wee did nothing in this buſineſſe this way, but for which we haue apparent warrant from the word, Yea further, we haue the plaine words of Chriſt for confirmation, where he telleth vs, *That this kind goeth not forth but by prayer and faſting.* But becauſe theſe words are oft alleaged, and being truly vnderſtood, make much for this cauſe,

I will open the meaning of them, as I now vpon more deliberation conceiue them. Something I differ from that which hitherto I haue followed, but I take it, this which I ſhall now remember, is moſt agreeable

Math. 10.

James 1. 8. 7.

agreeable to our Saviours meaning: And I wil neuer be assamed to
torme my iudgment, where I see truth doth ouerway me. I hus
then I doe interpret them. Whereas the Disciples demaunded why
they could not caste forth that diuel, Our Saviour doth answer to
this effect: Because (saith he) you are destitute of that faith & con-
fidence which once you had, when I sent you forth to preach by
two and by two, vnto the lost sheepe of the house of Israel. At that
time I gaue you power ouer vncleane spirits to cast them out, and
you prayed the authority I gaue you not to be in vaine: but after
that embassage was ended, as if your commission had expired with
that charge, you now doubted, whether you might exercise the sae
power still or no & whether I would be assistant vnto you in the
like worke: by which waivering you could not receaue this thing at
my handes, but deprived your selues of that confidence which you
should haue had in this cause: which if it had remained firme and
stable in you, though in quantity no more then a stayne of mult-
ard seede, there should haue bene nothing vnpossible vnto you, &
this deuill should haue gone forth at your first commande. This
then was your first error. Secondly you failed in this, that where-
as your extraordinary gift wanted, notwithstanding you set vpon
this worke extraordinarily: whereas in this case, you should onely
haue betaken your selues to the ordinary course, which is fasting
and prayer: for this kinde of diuel wherewith the child is possessed
goeth forth by no other meanes then the vsuall and common way
of humbling your selues, and intreating the same with al earnestnes
at the Lordes handes: vnderstandinge me of the ordinary meanes.
This interpretation ariseth most properly out of the wordes with-
out any violence: wherein the failing of faith in the disciples, is an
vtter defect of miraculous faith: the vse of fasting and prayer is not
an helpe to weake miraculous faith, which now in the disciples was
none at all, but the ordinary meanes where miraculous faith sayl-
eth.

These be the friuolous arguments, whereby you would dis-
prove the efficacie of Gods ordinance for the casting forth of Sa-
than by fasting and prayer as the meanes of wakening & strengthe-
ning of faith, to which the Lord graunteth all behouefull requests
to his children. Now followes the second parte, whether *Iustifyinge*
faith doth effect that worke. To which I answer: It doth, if you me-
ar e, It effecteth by obteyning. For what shall we not receaue by
Iustifying faith, so long as it craueth nothing: but that is warranted
by the

THE 9. DIALOGVE.

67

by the worde: It is our faith that ouercommeth the world, yea by which we overcome that wicked one, that is, the diuel. He that spared not his owne sonne but gaue him for vs all, how shall he not with him giue vs all things also? Doth not our Sauour ascribe many of his great workes he did, to the parties faith vpon whome they were done? Be of good cheere daughters, (saith he) thy faith hath saued thee. And that we may know this faith receauing his great workes, was in some a iustifying faith, to some he saide before he did the worke, Thy sinnes are forgiven thee. Now what doe you obiect against this doctrine? We heere the words of our Sauour All things are possible to him that beleeueth, make for confirmation thereof: you reply, This faith was not the Exorcists faiths but of the parties possess'd. I answer, we know no such difference, as if some one or two were Exorcists amongst vs, & all the rest of the people of other condicion, but the whole congregation is of one office, and one faith in this businesse, we be all ioint Exorcists, as I may so say, and by way of obteyning throwers out of satan. I gaue you obiect, That if iustifying faith hath this power, then it will overcome manifestly to all the elect of God, which I yealde you. But then say you, They which cannot effect this worke, may doubt of their iustification. I answer, this obiection fauors of very gross ignorance. You should be able to teach others, that the Lord hath not tyed himselfe to one vniforme order in bestowing of corporall blessings, as if all his children should obtaine all at all times. He hath not definitiue set downe in his worde, what, and when he wil giue vs in this kinde, but hath onely promised them vpon this condicion, So far as the good of his children, and his owne glorye shall require. Therefore though he graunt these outward things to some, and deny them being requested to other some, this difference is no cause we should stagger in our iustification. Besides say you, If iustifying faith were of this force, it would haue bene mentioned in such places where the effects of faith are purposely registred. Prove that all the effects of iustifying faith are there mentioned particularly & by name, else you trifle. Albeit S. James saith, If we resist the diuell he shall flye: noting generally our victory against him, not onely in his assaults, but also in his possessions. Expelling of deuils mentioned in S. Marke, belonged to a miraculous faith which was peculiarly giuen to some of the Christians of that age, such as were hearers of the Apostles, and beleeuers by their preaching: as heerebefore I haue shewed more then once. And therefore you might haue saued that labour in vsing so many wordes, & citing so many testimonies

1 John 5:4
2:14
Rom. 8:32

Math. 9:25

Math. 9:29

Marke 9:21
PSE: 294

pag. 395

James 4:7
pag. 296 &c
Mat 16:17

Doctrine
pag. 71
Detection in
the epistles

to proue the Sunne shines in a cleare heauen at mid-day:

A Survey of the Tenth Dialogue.

The tenth Dialogue treateth of *Miracles*, and laboreth to overthrow *dispossession of diuels in these times*, because such *dispossession* is a *miracle*, & *miracles* be expired long since. In prosecuting of which argument, it is strange to see how the *Discourgers* beate themselves with their owne rod. They would proue vnto vs that miracles are ceased, & yet afford vs no small miracle in their owne persons. For is it not wonderfull, that men thinking themselves to haue some sharpnesse of wit, to be furnished with sufficient copy of wordes, to haue perused many bookes, and to haue gathered great variety of learning, after some long time spent in denberation and conferēce, and then aduisedly committing to writing what they had cōceaued, Should notwithstanding all this, like men skarred out of their wits, and vitterly bereft of all power of discerning, take shadowes for bodies, bushes for men, chalke for cheese, and grope in the sun light, as in the darknesse. They haue shewed incredible blindenes in their former discourses, but in this booke of *Miracles*, it is Miraculous to behould the palpable errors they runne into. It may be they did of purpose herein obserue a decorum, that the strange handling of the matter, might be lutable to the title. But that I doe not seeme to charge them wrongfully, I will betake my selfe to the Suruey, first for more plainesse setting downe the truth in this poynr, and after rife vp their pedlers pack of deuices.

A true miracle therefore breifly may be defined thus, That it is an hard and vn-vsuall worke, surpassing all faculty of created nature, done by the diuine power, to that ende, it may moue the bebolders with admiration, and confirme their faith in the word of God. These true Miracles be of two sortes, for eyther they be wrought by the Lorde himselfe without any apparant meanes to vs, or else are effected by the ministry of man. Of the former kinde was the bush that burned, and consumed not in the sight of Moses: the pyllar of a cloude by day, and the pyllar of fire by night conducting the children of Israel out of Egypt: the slaughter in *Senacheribs* host of an hundred fourscore and fife thousand in one night: the star that directed the wise men out of the East, to the place of our Sauours birth, & such like. Concerning miracles of this nature, if one shall demanda whether they be ceased or no, it is to be answered, they are not. For the

Lorde

Exod. 3. 2.

Exod. 13. 21.

2 Kings 19.

35.

Math. 2.

Lorde hath reserved this liberty to himselfe, by extraordinary power to reueale his iudgments to the world, when and where it shall seeme best vnto him. And therefore our Sauour speakinge of his comming faith, *There shall be signes in the sunne, & in the Moone, and in the stars, & the power of heauen shall be shaken.* Shall we think these are no miracles? or that they be past, and not to come? Experience also confirmes the same. It were infinite to gather what hath happened in all ages since the publishing of the Gospell. I wil remember onely one or two for example in our owne times. Was it not the admiration of all Christendome to behould that bright and cleare new star which appeared in the yere 1572, continuing almost six monethes? But to come to our owne home, was it not a greate miracle that at a place called *Kynnaflone* neere *Marclech* hil in the county of *Hireford* certaine rookes with a peece of ground of twenty sixe acres, remoued and went forward the space of foure daies, removing forty paces in twelue houres, & carrying great trees & sheep coates, some with threescore sheepe in them, overthrowing *Kenna stone* chappel, altering two high waies nigh an hundred yardes, and where tillage ground was, leauing pasture, and where pasture, there tillage? yet all this was scene amongst vs the 17. of Feb. in the yere 1571. Therefore to speake in confused tearmes that miracles are ceased without distinction of their nature, is the parte of ignorant men, and of such as neither would finde out the truth, nor teach it: but only deceaue theselues & other with general words.

That second sort of miracles, which is done by the ministry of men, are all of them wrought by a miraculous faith, apprehending the extraordinary reuealed will of God concerning some strange worke, what, when & how it is to be performed. All which *Peter Martyr* distinguisheth by their *natures*, by their *effects*, and by the *speciall manner how they are done*. By their *natures*, for that some of them are admirable for the very thing done, being so strange and great as the like is not to be found in all nature. Such was the staying of the Sunne in the time of *Iosua*, and the turning back of the shadow to confirme *Ezekiab*, and such others. Some are not maruelous for the greatnesse of the thing done, but for the manner vsed in doing, as was the cloud and rayne of *Elyas*, the thundering of *Samuell*, and of the like sort. For such things are done naturally, but at that time were miracles in regard of the manner by which they were effected, that is, not by naturall causes, but at the commaund and wil of the Saints. In respect of the *effects*, some onely

Luke, 21, 25,
26.

loc.com, claf:
1: cap: 8, se 8,
4:

cause

cause admiration and feare, as the burning lampes and thunders in mount Sinai &c. some haue a deeper impression, partly for benefit, as the sick that were healed by Christ and his Apostles, partly in punishment, as when *Annianus* and *Sapphira* were strooke dead at the wordes of *Peter*. In regarde of speciall manner of workinge, some were done by prayer, as the dead childe restored to life by *Elisba*: Some by commaund, as *Peter* bid the lame man in the name of Iesus Christ arise and walk. Some neither by prayer, nor commaund, but of their owne accorde, the saints themselues occupied in som other matter, as when the shadow of *Peter* as he walked by did heale the sick: and the kercheils & handkercheils caried from *S. Paul* his body. All these done by the ministry of men are now ceased, for that the miraculous faith by which they were done neither is at this present, nor hath bene these many ages imparted to any. Thus then we see what a true miracle is; what be the diuers kindes, and which be remainyng in the Church and shall continue to the ende of the world: & which at this time are ceased.

Now to come to the other poynt: whether casting forth of diuels in these times by fasting & prayer be a miracle or no. To this I answer, it is not. *Chrysostome* saith, that Miracles were not done in his time. And *Augustine* affirmeth, that Miracles were not permitted to continue to his daies: least the minde should alwayes looke after wonder things, and mankinde should grow cold through the custome of these matters: by the novelty wherof in former time they did burne. But what neede I cite authors for this, when as your selues mainteine stronglie that Miracles ceased together with the Apostles? Wee then let vs to yne heerevnto, that casting forth of diuels by fasting & prayer were vsed in the times of *Chrysostome* & *Augustine*, as we haue shewed before by their owne wordes, which haue taught vs that their possid were brought, the publique assemblies, & deliuered by the prayers of the congregation, wherevpon it must needes follow, that this manner of deliuerance in *Chrysostomes* and *Augustines* iudgments, & so of the Church in their time, was no miracle. And the reason of this may be apparant by that description of miracles already set down. First because dispossellion of diuels was very frequent & common in their daies. But things common are no miracles. For a Miracle saith *Augustine*, is an vnwonted thing: And therefore (saith he) they are not done in these daies, Because they wilde not moue, except they were maruelous, neither would they be maruelous if they were vsuall. Secondly, for that the worke it selfe doth not make a miracle in respect of mans

Chrysost: in e
pist. 1. ad cor.
cap. 2. hom. 6
Aug. de ver.
relig. cap. 25

August dev.
tilitate cred.
ed Honorat.
cap. 16

of mans ministry, but the manner of doing, as hath bene shewed in the second distinction of Miracles. As for example, The cloud and the rayne sent at *Elyas* prayer was a miracle, because the Lord had reuealed it vnto him, and he had embraced the same by faith knowing when and how it should be sent. Yet when the Church of God in the time of drought and famyne, shall by publique praier obtaine cloudes & rayne, this is no miracle. As when *Salomon* saith, *when bea- Kings 2:35*
*men shall be soute vp, and there shall be no rayne, because they haue sinned against thee, and shall pray in this place, and confesse thy name, & turn from their sinne, when thou dost afflict them, Then beare thou in bea-
 men, and giue raine vpon the earth &c.* Dost he here pray they might be releued by miracle? Nay, but sheweth what the ordinary course of the Church is in this case. So when the Disciples cast forth diuels by their myraculous faith, and the Church now a daies by fasting & prayer, the same worke in substance is done by both, but the manner of doing is much differing, which makes a difference also in the S. Doctrina
 Action, and causeth that their worke was miraculous, & the same pag. 35
 done by the Church in these times not to be miraculous. This little may suffice for distinct vnderstanding of this doctrine: which diligently obserued will preferue vs from those horrible down-falls into which these blinde *Discourfers* tvmble themselves. Now then to examine theirs.

First we haue a definition of a *Miracle* in generall, to be an extraordinary worke of God, highly surmounting the whole faculty of euery created nature, to worke admiration in the beholders, and to confirme their faith in the truth of Gods word. Next we haue it deuided into the *scuerall kinde*, whereof the one is a *True miracle*, the other a *false* From whence it must needs follow that the generall definition must also agree to a *false miracle*. And that theretore a *false miracle* is an extraordinary worke of God, highly surmounting the whole faculty of euery created nature, to confirme the faith of the beholders in the truth of the worde. But this is a thing most absurd once to dreame of. Seing then to make a Generall whose definition can not agree to the Specialls, is a worke aboue nature: and that *M. Deacon* & *M. Walker* haue created such a Generall, I doe demonstratiuely therevpon conclude, That miracles are not yet ceased. pag. 306. &c.

Again, whereas I affirme, That casting forth of diuels in these times by fasting & prayer is no miracle: because it is done by ordinary meanes without the miraculous faith, (in which sence onely I vnderstand meanes, the vse whereof maketh a worke to be no mira-

page 311.

cle) you keepe a foolish iangling about this, in three pages together without either head or foote. Onely when in one place you began to conclude, according to your absurd manner you oppose the supernatural power of God, to his appointed meanes, as if ther were deadlie feude betwene them, so that they must needs kill and destroy one another. May it not be said, that *Moses* by his miraculous faith & his rod deuided the sea, as by the meanes, because the Lord in truth wrought the thinge by his owne mighty arme?

page 312. &c.

Genes. 43:36.

Moreover to stop your brawling mouthes you haue beene tould, that *Casting forth of duils in this sort, is a thing marueylous, but not miraculous.* Which difference, if you were not miraculously deprived of common sence, you might easily perceauie to be no lesse then is betwene the Generall & the Speciall. Euery Miraculous thing is marueylous, but not euery Marueylous thing miraculous. Except it was a miracle that *Ioseph* placed his brethren according to their auntyentie, because the *Egyptians* marueiled at it. *Cato* marueyled that one wysard, when he saw an other, could forbear laughing. was this forbearance of laughing in the wysardes a miracle? If this might passe for currant, we should haue as many miracles as we haue fooles, and so the world full of miracles. But you will proue it by Hebrew that *Marueyles & Miracles are all one*, because *Oth & Mopheth* are the same. But first you should haue proued that all marueyles are eyther *Oth* or *Mopheth*: which you neuer goe about: and it were but lost labour you should. So then the whole discourse for nine pages together, is an euident reasoning from the affirmation of the Generall, to the Speciall: as. if one should say thus, That which is a liuing creature is *M. Deacon & M. Walker*: But an Oxe is a liuing creature, and diners others his coosen germanes besides: Therefore an Oxe by this Logike should be as wise as your selues. Surely you haue found the Philosophers stone which is able to turne leade into gould: you can doe more then the spirits can: for you haue proued and I also beleeeue it, they cannot transforme one nature into an other, which I see is within the compasse of your Omniporency.

page 321. &c

You returne a fresh to *Miracles wrought by meanes*. Concerning which I tell you againe (for such importunate beggars wil not rest with one answer) that whatsoever is wrought by ordinary meanes onely, without miraculous faith, is no miracle. Now if you can shew that *Moses, Elijah, Elshua, Peter* and the rest wrought their admirable workes in such manner, then I will esteeme you for great wise men.

wife men. You affirme that *Dispossession of diuels were alwaies reputed true miracles in the Church of God*; which I haue manifested to be false by the testimonies of *Chrysostome & Augustine*. whereas you are pressed by *Exorcistes* that *If signes & wonders be true miracles incedde, then Anti-christ must also needes worke true miracles*. to shif of this (which you can neuer auoyd) you distinguish clarkly of that which is not in the syllogisme, to wit of Miracles in generall. The syllogisme mentioneth onely true Miracles, & therefore your distinction must needes be, That true miracles are of two sorts, either true or false, (which is your former miraculous diuision) or else you leaue the matter where it was, yealding that Anti-christ doth worke true miracles. But forsooth you will goe strictly to worke, and after some nipping disunctions, at last you discend to this, that *If I wrought a wonder at Mahanison, then I wrought an vndoubted true miracle*. must you needes still inferre a Speciall from the affirmation of the General? You abound in such admirable conclusions. Where you say, that *Expelling of Spirits, is no lesse maruelous now, then it was in the primitive Church*. If you meane the Church in the Apostles time, you say vntruly: It was done by miraculous faith then, it is not so now, which makes a difference in the worke, as hath bene shewed in *Elyab* his cloude, and that which is ordinarily obeyed by prayer. And this is all you can say to proue that *Expelling of diuels is now a myracle*: for which you haue not afforded the least coloure of any reason.

The rest of this Dialogue is spent in prouing that *Miracles are ceased*, wherein I might be silent, both considering *Dispossession* in these times is no miracle, and therefore nothing at all impeached by this discourse, and also for that I graunt the ceasinge of miracles according to such distinction; as hath bene before sett downe, that is, as they be wrought by the ministry of man. Neither doth any thing you bring weaken this truth, but rather much confirme it. Yet in handling this poynt you haue diuers vnseund positions. As if there were no other ende of miracles, but the *testification of Christ his Deity, & the confirmation of the Gospell*, whereas Miracles doe as well confirme the Law, as the Gospell, Iudgment, as well as Mercy. And the Lord alwaies hath & will testify his wrath from heauen against sinners, which will not beleue the threatnings of his word to forsake their wicked waies. Againe, say you, *Christs resurrection was the last Miracle for confirmation of his Deity*. Then what was his Ascension into heauen? Is it nothing with you? It being

ing also confirmed that *in these daies of Atheisme the Lord may and*
dash reveale his extraordinary power, for the terrifyinge of mens stony
hearts. You answer It is an irreligious insinuation, & a gap for all kna-
meries. but if you were able to weigh all things aright, you woulde
 see it were irreligious to sew pillowes vnder mens elbowes, and as
 for the gap to knaury, what window can be opened, when the mini-
 stery of man is wholly excluded, & these wondrous workes left im-
 mediately to the Lord himselfe: you are in ad when you see not the
 difference betweene the Papists dealing in this businelle, and that of
 the Church of God. *D. Fulke* doth worthely reprove *their lying mi-*
racle, but bring forth one word out of him, wherein he giues the
 least check to this manner of work done by God his faithful people
 against which you haue no lesse ignorantly, then proudly vaunted
 your selues like two mighty Goliaths. As for those Learned men
 which you challenge to mainteine this cause against you, would
 you haue them to itrayn themselves with such trileters: It is inough
 for them to leaue such as my selfe, vnworthy to carry their bookes,
 to lash such bayards. All your reasons against Miracles conclude on
 ly against such as are done by the ministry of man: and so likewise
 your testimonies vnto which I willingly subscribe. Onely, good Rea-
 der, marke that *D. Fulke* (who is the fourteenth in order) speaking
 against an ordinary function in the Church to cast forth diuels, mea-
 eth a peculyar office of Exorcists, as it is in the popish Church, ap-
 pointed to this purpose. There is no such office left by Christ:
 but that a faithfull congregation making suite to the Lord in theme-
 diation of his Sonne, hath no promise to obtaine the deliuerance
 of their brethren from the vexation of diuels, it neuer came into
 his heart (for any thing I could euer see by his writings) to thinke.
 But these men according to their manner, alleadg one thing for an
 other: euery clod in the fallow, is an hare with them, and they can
 follow it with as full cry, as if the best game that is were on foote be
 fore them. Well now, Christian Reader, that I haue layd open ther
 dealing vnto thee, be thou thy selfe Iudge, whether in the begining
 my speach exceeded any thing or no. I doubt not, but thou thy self
 wilt be amased to see men so bereft of all iudgment: and that thou
 wilt behould in them a manifest example of that bewitching, where-
 with *S. Paule* did charge the foolish *Galathians*. I hope also thou wilt
 rather be a meanes to free these men from the snares, where with
 thou seest them intangled, then suffer thy selfe to be intrapped with
 them. And therefore relying vpon thy Christian wisdom in this
 beehalfe

pag. 327.

page. 329.

pag. 330. &c.

Pag 333

gal. 3.1.

behalf, I proceede to the last Dialogue.

A Survey of the Eleventh Dialogue.

The first part of this Dialogue is the sinke of all the former, being nothing else but a *Recapitulation* of them: we haue proued the seuerall channels vnflauory ynough: I meane not heere to styrt the afresh. The second part is a *Patheticall persuasion*: *Patheticall* indeede both to him that would reioyce at the infirmity of others, for it would make him to laugh; and also to him that greeveth at their harmes, for it would make him to pittie you. *It is no discreditte you Discoversers, that I am afrayd of, No scandall to zealous professors, No suspicion of Conspiracy, No confirmation of the B. nor any other such fōd respects, that causeth me to be stiff in opinion.* I hope the Lord will assist me (it is my prayer that he will) that I shall treade all these vnder my feete, and greater matters then these if neede be, for his truthe sake. But if any can disproue the actions that haue bene done for matter of fact, or any thing that I haue deliuered or taught, by sound doctrine out of the truth of God his worde, I will giue glorie to the Lord, & confesse my self to haue erred and bene deceaued, al though for deceauing, the God of heauen & earth is witnes it neuer came into my harte. *As for losse of mayntenance, & deprivation from Ecclesiasticall dignity, neyther doe these moue me one whit.* This is your lilly cunning vnder pretence of alleading for me, to write your owne Apologie. You comfort your selues with a Discourse, *That no man is able to make a flat nullitie in any mans ministry.* Deceauie not your selues *M. Deacon & M. Walker*: The Church may deprive of their ministry such as by erroneous crimes deserue it. May not the Church make a Minister that hath greuously offended the congregation, & continueth obstinate, as one that is a *Publicane & an heathen*? Doe you thinke an Heathen may houlde the place of a Minister ouer the Church of God? Againe, such as making shipwrack of a good conscience are deliuered to Sathan, can they during their subiection be fit captaines against him, to the people of God? *The salt that hath lost his savor, with what shall it be seasoned? It is good for nothing but to be cast forth, & to be trodden vnder foote by men.* How shall he reprove others, that is reprovved by all? How shall he which teacheth not himselfe, teach an other? How shall the knowne Adulterer commaund others not to commit Acutery? *Let a Bishop be vnblameable,* saith the Apostle: which charge hath

page 339

page 347

pag 349-350

Math: 18. 17

Tim: 1: 20

Math: 5, 15

Rom 2, 21-23

Tim: 3, 2

Psal 50, 16

pag: 340

1 King: 22, 24
Mica, 3, 6

Zach: 11, 17

Psal. 50, 11

not onely place in his first Election; but also the whole time he con-
tynueth in his office. Vnto the wicked (saith God) what hast thou to do
to declare mine ordinances, that thou shouldst take my cunctant into
thy mouth, Seeing thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast my wordes be-
hinde thee? For when thou setst a thee thou runnest with him, and thou
art partaker with the Adulterers. Therefore this consolation of yours
will deceaue you. But you say, where God doth continue his gracions
guists in any, there ought to be also continued the execution of the guists.
This also is a rotten foundation. I doubt not but the fallie Apollies
retayned still their guist of speech, wherin they seemed to surpasse
S. Paul. Besides a man may falsly iudge of his owne guists. When
went the Spirit of the Lord from mee, to speake vnto thee, said Zidkiah
vnto Michaiab? Indeeede the Lord doth threaten that night shall be to
false prophets for a vision, and darknes for a diuination: that the Sunne
shall go downe ouer them, & that the day shall be darke. And I beseech
you weigh but with indifferency (if it be possible in your own case)
if in these discourses, The sworde of the Lord hath not bene vpon your
right eye. All these things considered, stand not (I beseech you) in
defence of error and wickednes. Regard I haue stricken you, ra-
ther vpon the garments, then vpon the bare skin. Indignation som-
times hath wrung from me sharpe speech, yet such as hath wound-
ed no further, then for Schoole matters, except your selues will.
Receauue therefore the word of exhortation. Let your defence be
confession: your reply, teares: your inueighing against others, I haue
sinned: your suite for preferment, to be in the number of Gods ch-
ildren. VVhat if the Church sleepe in doing her duty? He that kee-
peth Israell neither slumbreth, nor sleepeth. VVhat if the Lord also for
a time keepe silence? Indeeede, saith he, I held my tongue: & thou th-
oughtest I was like thee: but I will reprove thee, & set thy liues in order
before thee. It is a fearfull thing to fall into the hands of God. Who
shall pleade for vs, when all shall stand at the same barre with vs?
The Lord graunt my wordes may haue due place with you, that in
steade of prouing me a counterfeyt (which your discourses intend)
you may gaine your selues true Christians, whereby your losse in
fayling of your purpose may turne to your aduantage, & my griefe
in sustayning so many reproches, may in the ende yeild me & all the
angels of God, great matter of ioy.

In the meane season, I humbly thanke the Lord which yet at
last hath opened your mouthes to acknowledge the truth in some
parte. For proceedinge in your course, and comming to speake of a
precompacted

precompact confederacy, towards the ende you give euident testimony of mine innocency, affirming that *Howsoever others esteeme* Page 352.
of any compact, for your owne partes (you assure mee) you are very far
from such a suspicion, yea & this also you dare say for so many besides, as
haue bene acquainted with my former sincerity, and upright carriage,
they are euery of them free from such a perswasion. And this onely, say
you, is that which we entertaine, & very confidently hold for a truth,
Namely that the gracelesse boy, did gracelessly counterfeyt, & knauishly
beare the world in hand, he was really possessed of Sathan, when there
was no such matter at all. But as concerning your selfe, we doe vndoubt-
edly thinke, that the same was simply your error in iudgment, but no
purposed error in your practise at all. This is your testimony. Seeing
therefore you are so perswaded of me in your consciences, how coes
it to passe, that through your whole discourses you haue traduced
me as a deceauer? And namely in your Answer, pag: 39. 40.
wherespeaking of Somers his supernaturall knowledg, you shift that
of, by ascribing his predictions &c: to some cunning confederacies with
me. Why should we wonder at all (say you) that two cunning company-
ons confederate together before, should conclude such a course betwene the
selues, as the one (by the helpe of the other) should prognosticate such stra-
nge & incredible euents, &c. Haue you there striuen against consci-
ences? Or hath the truth heere preuayled against your willes? Sure-
ly it is wonderfull that men seeking fauour by soothing, and hoping
for some great aduantage by iustifying other mens indirect courses,
should notwithstanding the B! his violent dealing, whether by im-
prisonment, or by pretence of law whatsoeuer, notwithstanding also
M. Harsnets authentickall-booke, written for confirmation of the
sayd proceedings, yea notwithstanding their owne endes, and long
tedious paynes to compasse them, should I say, notwithstanding all
these, after many discourses cleare me altogether of the pretended crime
and thereby withall shew that the Bishop hath dealt vniustly, M. Ha-
rsnet falsely, and they themselues wickedly in ioyning hands to oppr-
esse the guiltlesse. It is the Lord which catcheth the wise in their owne cra-
ftynesse. Neither doe I onely in this your confession behold the vic-
tory of truth ouer your selues, but am forced to prayse the Lord
for his great goodnesse, which hath made the BISHOPPE him-
selfe (the greatest Aduersary to this cause) to subscribe to my vp-
rightnesse in it. Your booke comes forth by his priuiledge. No
doubt it was perused, & perused againe. It lay a long time in his
handes. And who can tell whether this testimony be not his owne
wordes

1 Cor. 3. 19.

wordes set downe vnder your names: It may be the Lord hath touched his heart for that he did against me. And howbeit publique confession were requisite in publique wrongs, yet it is some ease to some mens consciences to make confession couertly. whatsoeuer therefore other men may thinke, That he would be farre from such acknowledgment, yet I will hope the best, as knowing there is nothing vnpossible vnto the Lord. Neyther skills it greatly whether he writt these very wordes or no, considering he hath allowed & approued them at least, in giuing them publique passage and priuiledg to the. And therefore though *S. Paul*, when the Sericants were sent vnto him, refused to depart secretly out of prison, but as by publique authority he was cast in, so by the same authority he would be brought forth: yet I being beyond comparifon inferior to him, will rest my selfe content in hauing my open iniuries satisfied, though but in this secret manner. How good and gracious is the Lord which bringeth forth the righteousnesse of his seruants as the light, & their iudgment as the noone day. As he dealt with our heade Christ in causing *Pilat* to pronounce him a iust man, so he dealeth with his poore members accordinge to their seuerall degrees. Hee made *Saul* acknowledg *Dauid* more righteous then him selfe, & *Agrippa* & *Festus* to say of *Paule*, *He had done nothing worthy of bonds.* To this therefore onely wise, & gracious, & Mighty Lord God, the father, the Sonne, & the holy spirit, be all honor & praise for ever & euer.

Amen,

FINIS,

149

A *francesco*

SURVEY OF CERTAINE DIALOGICAL

DISCOURSES: VVITTEN BY IOHN

DEACON, AND IOHN WALKER,

concerning the doctrine of Possession
and Dispossession of Diuels.

VVHEREIN IS MANIFESTED THE PALPABLE IGNORANCE AND DANGEROVS

errors of the *Discourfers*, and what according to proportion of God his truth, every christian is to hold in these poymes.

Published by *John Darrell* minister of the gospel.



Titus 1. 10. 11.

There are many disobedient and vaine talkers, and deceivers of mindes, teaching thinges, which they ought not, for filthy lucre sake, whose mouthes must be stopped.

IMPRINTED 1602.

TO THE READER, VVITH ANSVVERE to the Discourfers two epistles.

It greiues me (christian reader) I assure thee, still perforce to be thus troublesome not onely to my selfe, but also to thee. It must needes be enough, and more then enough for thee, to haue perused so many simple treatises already, all harping on one string. And as for my selfe, how can I after so great vexation by the B. of London, so long imprisonment, such publicke productment into open courts, & lastly my paynes to cleare the truth frō M. Hasnerts slanders, but like a tired & weather beaten bird, with sōe guyes corner to rest my selfe in, & to dry my feathers in the warme sunne? But it is not my lot, I thinke, to breath me, no not a litle: For behold two new chātions, that haue been bucklinge on their harness these two or three yeares, with a proud swelling volume like a Spanishe Armada, challenge me afresh to a new encounter. Wherin yet this comforts me, that at this new on set is an open declaration to the world, that in these mens Iudgments at the least, the Bish:op with his home forces hath bene to weak. Neither this onely, but even the B. himselfe by entertaininge this fresh ayde, doth as it were plainly confesse, his victory to be as yet imperfect. Otherwise it were idle yther for them to offer, or him to embrace a needles supply, if they perceived not their former platforms by that poore battery, which my corēned writings haue made, to be tottering & falling. Blessed be God which though he suffer his truth to be shrewdly pressed, yet not to be altogether oppressed, to be shrewdly thrust at, yet not viterly cast downe: to be laden indeed with heauie burdens, yet to grow vnder them like a prevailling palme. Gre at is the power I see of a iust cause, how simple so ever her taile be. But what? shall the matter now be put out of all doubt? Must it needes in these Dialogues be convinced by Logike, and perswaded by Rhetorike, that all this bruite of Possession and Dispossession is but a mere deceit? O foolish and vnadvised men, which thinke to overthrow that by sond Sophisticall words, which by sad wordes and deedes hath not hether to beene vanquished. No doubt men of iudgment will heerein deeme the Bishop to haue failed in a great point of circumspection, in committing the brunt & execution of a battayle to these the weakest and cowardliest companies he hath. For if himselfe could not be satisfied to haue wounded the cause to his power, with the sword of his authority, but that he must needes raze the memory of it with consuming fire, he should not for performance thereof haue sent vs this Ignis fatrus, as every one may easily discern this to be.

I pray thee Christian Reader, haue patience with me. I will spare my paynes, and myne owne, as much as I can. My purpose is not to man out an other Gallasse like this Discourfers gallant, but to set vpon it with my
poore

To the Reader

poore fisher boate, & yet I hope by God his assistance to make her lay her top
sayle in the broth. Neither thinke thou, I endeavour hereby a defence more
for my selfe, then for thee. I could haue contemned their frivolous reproches,
had it not bene thou wert greatly endangered by the manifold grosse errors
where with they would poyson thee. And therefore intending thy good, more
then myne owne credit, I will take a breife view of their Dialogicall Dis
courses before I come to them which properly concerne me.

These Discourses be fronted with a double epistle, one to the Right H.
the L. Keeper, and chiefe Iudges of the land, to which we will answer a
uome. the other to the Reader: wherein omitting their earnest care to find
out the truth in this doctrine, proceeding even to diffinition betwene thes
two, otherwise sworne brethren in matters of fact, first we haue a large re
beawfull of sundry reasons for the edition of this treatise, both wherefore it
bath bene hitherto suppressed, and also for what causes now at last it is
published. For suppressing the regard of your owne imperfections were
not to be misliked, if you had not repented of this humilitie so soone. But
I can hardly beleue you conceaued so meanely of your owne facultie, as to
feare the censure of any for scholasticall forme, your whole discourse is so
Analyticall, & your Philologus & Othodoxus such ripe & pregnant
conclusions, besides your continuall repoynding me with my Hotchpotch
and vs all which haue dealt in this cause with our intricate riddles. Nei
ther can I thinke you distrustful, nor eloquence as you pretend, wherein you
brave it so every where. Whether it be Ciceronian vernish or no, I cannot
tell, my skill is not great. In my poore iudgment, to giue you your right, the
sentences are well fluffed with good reasoning wordes, able to still the babes
crying, & replenish chilhoodes with many timely epibithes, sweetly bur
zing in every corner like a swarme of flies. I graunt you that there be many
busy controuersers of other mens labours. But why should you feare a quip
for a point of learning, which haue injured your faces not to blush at grea
ter matters? No doubt your compassion and care of me was great: least
by publishing this worke, you should increase my affliction. such is the cha
ritable regard you carry towards me in this you haue published, in every
page imbracing me no lesse tenderly then the Ape her young ones. Lastly
you hoped, Authority might haue caused silence: for which purpose you
remember the obedience of the prophet to Amaziah his command,
after he had done his message, though not so fully as he would, yet sufficie
ly: such is your great skile, or at least your fidelitie in reasoning, that by
your rule, the hungry man must patiently fast, because he doth so which hath
his belly full. Withall you would faine charge our stirring in this cause,
with want of respect to her Maiesties Princely prerogative, but in ans
were

TO THE READER

were to you. Queres this imputation shall appere to be no lesse absurde, then wilitions, and you seies rather pernicious Speophants, then we in the smallest allegorisme vnderiustfull. And thus haue we, these worthy reasons for suppressing as for aile to this end, as if one should suppress water with a iune.

Now what great motives thrust forward the publishing forsooth, for that some Malecontents vndermined the authoritie of the high commission: when as only the bad doctouring of some in the commission was iustly reprov'd, the Commissioners stiffe not once eyther touched, or meat. But heere your eyes daseled, and could not discern the wood for the trees: the Person, and the office with you must be all one, you knowe no difference betwene Mises, charyng, and a phisicall life. But Buike say you must neede deshaue a ban: Well Mr. Deacon, and Mr. V. Vaiker, make much of this banke, y^e that might haue rested, quietly in forgetfulnes, if you take not good breede, as y^e haue more v^e of it ere long you seies then you would. There are great motives, y^e at this case is so way, but, that we must haue a iust halfe score reasons more to satisfie the world for sending this treatise abroad. Should perenture were these fewe allye. It were but mispendinge the time, so howe the world mighte haue with you. Therefore to please here with these one, This is the p^rid and shal allegations, to crosse the opinion of a Necessarie perpetuall of Miracles, to be frequed with y^e owne shaddomes, and as bescom thmen of you quality to face, where no feare is. who ingeth Perpetuall of Miracles, I haue I any where affirmed it? Nay, haue not I earnestly oppied my selfe as ainst it? Eyther prooue me vntreue if you can, or comfesse your selfe to be past all shame, who will needes rather that vpon me. I haue affirmed, but the contrary, which you seies also testify co. tradition 15. Your fourth reason hath some more substance in it, then all the rest. You feared my credit would be too great. To free you from this feare: I haue learned by Gods goodnes not to glory in this, or the like things, and so my power abilitie I haue alwayes enform'd my auditors accordingly. And sure y^e you, if there be any glory in such like actions, and your selves for members of that body you make shew of, would rather haue joyced in the fellowship of it, then haue greined through enuy, & disgraced the same by all the meanes you can. Fiftly y^e doubted least the conscience of some might be troubled with scruple, if iustifying faith be the instrument of such workes, sith allendewd with than faith bring not the lyke to passe. But I pray your great learning tell me by what faith obayn we dayly breade? Was Lazarus to doubt of his faiths cause he was not satisfied with the testimony of the Rich man a bly. Hath the Lord bowed himselfe to bestowe all corporal blessings vpon each of the saythfull, and in the same

TO THE READER.

measure also? Or are you only ignorant in this A B C, which every Christian knows? I will not dispute this matter further with you for shame. Whereas you say eighthly, we have bene convinced for grosse malefactors. I bolde marvaile at your imprudency, but that I knowe with what meits. I goe for heads befiled. If we were convicted for such as you say, what was the sentence of our condemnation? what was the punishment? what became of the execution? As for our deprivation from the ministry, was this an inflicted payne for teaching to countenance, wherewith M. More was never charged, and yet deprieved as well as I? or rather the B. b. only pleasure, who least they bolde seeme to make all this stir for nothing, & not finding such cause as they desired, chose rather by laying this vpon vs to maintaine the reputation of their owne wisdom, then to punish vs for the desert of such a crime. If they had found our fault worthy thus to be censured, I hope they would not be so partiall, as to suffer all the rest of the practiser, in the same rank of guiltynesse with vs, eyther not to be called to accompt at all, or being examyned to be dismissed againe without any correction. I wolde desire you (if any honest request may prevaile with men of your stampe,) that if you must needs be lying you would lye with more probability least all the world cry shame of you. Tentibly your Scorpious sting is ever wagging, in objecting disobedience to the Magistrate, and printinge without pryvilege: you shall receive answer in your Queres where you urge this matter more importunately. And thus much for the wynde that moved the Aspen tree, of whose leaves it seemes, for all your reasons yet alledged, your tongues are made.

The rest of the Epistle is spent in preventinge lawish tongues, against whom you fence both your Persons, and your Cause. For your Persons, and first for your learning, It is ioy that men of your skyll can be so humble. Howsoever you in modesty deeme your selves Minimi Apostolorum, the least of ten thousand: yet for my part when I consider the multitude of good Authors prefixed before your Dialogues, and scattered sentences in them, & how little you are behoulding to any of them in the cheefest points you handle, having through the quicknes of your owne conceits found out that, which they never once dreamed of. When I say, I consider these things, I am forced to yeild this praise vnto you: that you are profound Rhapsodistes, & men expert in Tablatum, which by the helpe of an Index are able in some few yeares to marshall a troope of sentences and Authors to some terrible show. Besides who can but comend, as your multiplicity of reading, so your faithfulness in alleging, which would not use the phrase of Dare tranus, but cite your Author M. Tullius Cicero for it: which phrase only, hath put Cicero in the list of Authors to make

TO THE READER.

make up the number: and the like diligence hath afforded vs the names of diuers others. Nay me thinkes I see in you the skil of prudent Captaynes, which to terrify their enemies, can make an handfull of men seeme like a great multitude, some one seeming two, yea sometimes three. This stratageme hath placed Aristotle in A, & Philosophus for the selfe same author in the letter P. So Iohannes Darrell being a great learned mā, first makes one in the ranke of I, & the Narration of Darrell an other in the troopes of N. But Gregorius in G keepe a terrible storr: for first he is put downe simply Gregorius, then againe Gregorius Magnus, and the third time Gregorius 1. Rom. and yet all these are but one. You must needes ouercome, which are so full of pollicie, not inferior to Cyrus, that by certain Idols made for the nonce, and men of straw, tooke Crefus at Sardis. Feare not therefore ye learned Discoursters, howsoever the ignorāt may lightly passe over your Table, painted margēs, & many authorities without due regard, yet the Iudiciall Reader (able to distinguish betwene a counterfeyt, & a grounded knowledge,) will giue you such commendation as you deserue.

For the carriage of your liues precedent & present, we haue a whole page perswaded with many flowenly tearmes. And herein you lay abut you mightily, bragging your selues like butchers mastiues with their collers of iron pykes, & daring any to set vpon you. If your hornes peepe out of the bushes whether you are fled for covert, you may thanke your selues which haue eaten away the leaues. Yet I will passe by you, as though I sawe you not: not for any feare of your vchins skyn, where-with you thinke you are sufficiently armed, but for that I thinke it better to passe by you in silence, then to utter that which you deserue to heare, and to lay you open in your colours. I will only admaunde this of you, how you durst dedicate your treatise to the Right Honorable Lord Keeper, to the Lorde Chiefe Iustice of England, and other the cheif Iudges of the land, by this meanes to occasion them to enquire of your person? I say no more, let this suffice for answer of that Epistle of yours to their Honours, as I promised you. Yet I must needes tell you, that when you say, we sport our selues in brading our brethren, with the odious name of Formalists, you say vnto traly. We accous them Formalists, which forme and fashon themselves like vnto this world: & not they which are crucified vnto the world, and the world vnto them, albeit in some things they dissent from vs in opinion. And instead of branding such with this or any other odious name: if they be of the anmeiment, we call and reuerence them as fathers: if others, we tearme and loue them as brethren. From these and the cause they speake of, is beinge body
and

TO THE READER.

and so I, if this copy of mine should quite failen, to the embracing
of you present wrd, & second Apoptates, reuolters and back-ly-
ders, w^{ch} if they say they w^{ill} euer h^{ow}er to heare, let the know
that this Apoptacy of theirs, is not the least of th^{er} sⁱⁿes, nor easie to
repented of. But to let all this pass, c^{on}cerning your cause, if you will
as you say, be content that it be tryed by the sⁱⁿc^{er}e of Gods truth, you
shall doe well. For your forme by Dialogue and other order in follo-
wing the cause, it is at your pleasure, I know none ready to excepte a-
gainst it. If you bring truth, it shall be acceptable in what forme so e-
uer.

For your Queres, whether her Maiesty hath authority to establish
in her dominions an order for printing with priuiledge, belike you
were assured when you moued this Quere to spend words in a need
dissuasiuⁿ, neuer denied, or doubted of. All Princes haue authoritie
in their seuerall kingdomes to constitute some conuenient order in this be-
halfe, and this case is both holy and good. How can the whole lump pos-
sible not be ordered, if euery man might thrust in his leaue at his ple-
asure? But then you demand further, whether euery one be not stri-
tly bound to obserue this order? I answer euery one is stritly bound
to obserue the meaning of the law, wh^{ch} is, to suppress falshood & wic-
kednes. But when such officers shall come in place to be sett ouer this cha-
rge (as no Prince in the world can alwaies voyd it) which instead of
suppressing error & sinne, will according to their owne deceaued humors
suppress truth and v^{er}itie: here the meaning of the law is to be looked in-
to, & practised, and the letter is not precisely to be stood upon, which is
abused by unworthie persons to a wrong purpose. Is not the end of all
lawes the good of the common wealth? Should one, or some few mens abu-
sed authoritie spall all the subiects, yea & the Prince himselfe of the
clear vnderstanding of any necessary profit? If nothing may come to the
governors eares, but what is priuiledged by the high Priests, the soldiers
may say Christ was stolen away by his disciples, or what they will else.
Therefore when in w^{ay}le in case to examine before printing, it is requi-
site such bookes should be examined after printing, that the meaning of
the law may be obserued, and the people with error not seduced. You
see in the w^{ay}le there is a writ of error, and the honorable Iudges suf-
fer willingly a sentence wrung from them by any deceit, vpon better
proceeding to be reversed. Yea there is an appeal to the high court of
Chancery, though law hath established a determination in the seuerall
Courts. Neither doth her Maiesty herselfe (of her gracious goodness) dis-
claim to receaue the supplications of her poore subiects, than think she
selves

TO THE READER.

felues injured elsewhere. And yet strict course of law doth not allowe such proceedings, but rather inhibiteth it: commaunding vs to stand to the definitive sentence of the Iudges. Now what else is a truth published in print without privilege, but a supplication to the Prince and people for redress of her injuries may rather for redress of their owne injuries, which are endangered by allowance of trumpery to abandon truth, & so to cast themselves into those manifold mischiefs which proceed from error. Good men and wise and most obedient to their gouernours; haue in all ages, and do at this day in all places of Christendom, practise according to this rule, or else God his truth would be in pitifull case. Are not you then egregious Sycophants which doe vehemently condemn all the godly upon so foolish a conceit? Are not such as you a flattering poison to Princes, which would transforme them from gracious gouernours, into basefull Tyrants? It were not amisse that such skilfull w^{ch} kⁿ n, which be called a Ball for Phalaris, should call if they cunning with themselves. What Tyrant when he hath done one injury, will not suffer him so much as to grieve for his wrong? would you haue truth wounded, & not allow her to conuayne? Indeed Tereus when he had deuoured Phylomela, cut out her tongue: and this earnestnes of these Discouriers in this behauiour sheweth suspicion, there is something in the winde, wherefore it should be behoouefull for them, that not only mens hands might be kept from printing, but also the mouths of all that know them might be surely locked vp, & that themselves might keepe the keyes.

That is
truths

The remainder of your Epistle shewes the order of the Discourse. Your Alphabetically table, with the Seuerall names of the Seuerall Authors, and their Seuerall authorities we haue touched before. Let further take this with you, that as Iehoua caused the heads of the 70. so ones of Chab to be layd on two heaves in the gates of Iezrebel, so these names you produce be no bands of friends, ready to stand in your defence: but to shew how many you haue expresse slain: in this cause, infinite others being also wounded in them. Your arguments will saue me a labour: for I shall neede no other collection of your abusive discourses, in this in profite. (your first dialogue excepted) as your argument be. Your Ananias is handsomely checkered one part with in another, like a motley cloke bag. For first you say, the diuel his power, is either a power of possession or obsession when possession & Obsession in such mens writings as treat these points are used for all one. Then Possession in your discourse you make only to be outward, and yet Mentall Possession is left grow from it. as figs upon thornes. If you say you mean possession vulgarly, neither is that true, for vulgarly it is applied to that vexation

B I

which

TO THE READER.

which appeareth in the torture of the body. But your Mentall affliction is severally & solely by it selfe a Possession. The next division is either Reall, or Actuall. What? haue we now a Reall possession, wherein is no action? This indeede is a gentle possi^{ss}ion. Again, Corporall poss^{ss}ion is either by assuming true bodies, or transforming: whereby good angels haue made possessors & tormenters of men, as shall be shewed more in due place. You haue presented vs heere therefore with an analytical table, instead of a table: laboring to stop our mouths with one gallimaufry serued vp in diuers dishes, as if any two words vnder a pare of emynall lins were suffic^{ie}nt for such a purpose. For your Speakers in the Dialogues Philologus rattles prettily & answers his name well, but Physiologus might better be termed Philalogus, for he is but a Dunce in Phil^osophy, & your Orthodoxus is as rightly so called, as Iohn Deacon was sometimes A. V. Walker. Your Tables in the end might well haue bene spared. I thinke he which hath once read your treatise, wil not be great ly desirous to finde out any point to reade it againe. And thus at last we haue an end of the Epistle, to be comended cheeryly in this, that not onlie by the length it with-houldeth sometime the Reader from the treatise it selfe, but also by the fardnes might iustly bring him in disast with the rest, and so cause him to spare his paynes from proceeding any further, which perhaps be shall perceiue to be no small benefit.

I. D.

A SURVEY OF THE FIRST DIALOGUE

Though concerning those greate workes of God in freeing diuers from vexation of dyuels, at the hartye prayers of his people, wherein *M. More* and my selfe haue ioyned with them, these Dyalogues containe stuffe little to the purpose, considering the question is of matter of fact, whether any be freed from such vexation, or no, and not of the manner, how such vexation is wrought, which is hard for any mortall vnderstanding exactly to define: yet because Errors in doctrine be exceeding dangerous, & of admyrable increase, euery seede bringing forth a thousand: I haue thought it not amisse to admonish thee Good Reader, in as breif manner as I can, what trumpet yeth hid in each seuerall dialogue: and the rather for that they were intended to disgrace that fact: which indeed they doe asmuch as the rage of man vually doth the mighty operations of God: that is, they more increase the glory of it. For your first dialogue therefore, It is true that there are diuells: that Diuells are no bare motions or affections, but natures spirituall, substantiall, and of personall beinge: which be called Angels: yet you speake dangerously when you say there be *Essentiall Diuells as appeareth by their creation*, as if by creation they had bene made such: you disclayne this wicked opynion afterwards I confesse, and reason against it by some arguments: but euery one reades not all: & it beehoues vs, least occasion of error be ministred to any, to vse wordes offoundnesse in euery place.

pag. 1.

Your *Mabynston* for *Nottingham*, *Ennyab* for *Beauerie* & *Esbrad* for *Darbie*: seemes to be some pedlers french, such as vpriight men once practised when they ranged the country with their queaness: It is small credit for you to be expert in this language.

M. Deacon
you know
what I
meane

For the substance of that which followeth in prouing *Spirits to be subsisting natures*: It is generally to be allowed and embraced. And it had bene to be wished, you had kept the same moderation in the rest: that you should haue bene content to haue trodden in the steps of oober godly & learned, as in this you haue in some sort done: rather then haue runne new courses: both hurtfull to others & pernicious to your selues.

A Survey of the Second Dialogue.

The second Dialagon dryeth to thine cheifheads. The first treatinge of possession generally, & making it common to all affliction (by the diuelt) tormenting, & tempting both inwardlie and outwardlie, whereas the affliction of the minde is only called the trouble of conscience. & Sathan his tempting of man, temptation or suggestion, but neither of them seauered by the state of possession any where. This worde is proper to them, whose bodies be extraordinarily racked or rent by Sathan, as the boy was *Marke. 9, 20*.

pag. 40

A SURVEY OF

2

De Ideo-
v. 10. 11.
1. M. 8. 18
C. 10. H. 1.
m. 10. 11.
p. 17.
in M. 1. 1.
De Opt. 10.
C. 10. 11.
p. 17.
in M. 1. 1.
A. 10. 11.
p. 17.
p. 17.

Besides you distinguish betwene *possession* and *obsession*, contrary to the custome of all which deale in this argument. *Cyprian* saith, *Di- uells aduised by vs, are compelled to goe out of the bodies possessed.* And *Dio- nysius Carthusianus*, in one *obsessed* there was a legiⁿ of *diuells* *Chennicus* treating of this argument, vseth ordinarily the worde *obsessi* n. And in like manner doe other both of auncient and latter time. Yea I dare be bold to say that where once in this argument writers vse the words *possession*, *possession*, *possession*, they haue *obsessi* n, *obsessi* n, and *obsessi* n. So that where you make *obsessi* n common to all men in the world in the language of the learned, All men shold be *Demoniacks*: which though your pallat be so grosse that you cannot discerne how vnfauori it is, yet others can feelee with their fingers to be most absurd. But this was your ignorance, which eyer knew not, or did not well con- sider what *Obsessi* n meant, as we shall shew more afterwards: And therefore as becometh men of *private opinion*, you bring vs significati- ons forged in your owne mynt.

Three dle
to the Rea-
der p. 1

After you tell vs, that *possession* is nowhere any reall inherency: In- deede we know, *Possession* signifies to haue a thing in ones power by any meanes how soeuer, as when may possesse an horse, although he be not in his bridle? Neither doe they which argue a reall inherencie reason from the word *Possession* as you fondly and childishly imagine, but from other most plaine termes, of necessitye enforcing so much, as haue declared in convenient place. If now *Possession* import no re- ally reallie, then you commit a double notable folly: first that you blame the *English* *Translator* for the saying: *that word is in the text, wher- by the whole world hath bene deceived*: *Possessi* n as you say, with many great errors concealing the *Diuel* in supposed *possession* in man: I am glad our *English* translation is receaued vniuersallye through the whole world: for otherwise, I hope the whole worlde would not vn- necessarily be deceived by it. But I pray you, since your wordes be your owne, if *Possession* carry no meaning of inherency, what hurt could the *English* translator doe, to the breedinge of this opinion in any, by vsing this wor in the text: your fingers itched vntill you were scratching the *English* translation: How els should we haue knowne you to be great singuliers? Secondlye if *possession* signifye no substantiall inherency, to what end is your reuerend Discontent that the word *Possessi* n is in where? And in this argumente againe in the old *Scripture* pure vs. *The new* you would make vs beleue in your first dialogue against me, it might probably be disputed, that it is a *thing before* e *comming* of *Christ* there were no essentiall *possession*: as all *Christ* in *Christ* his time then it should seeme that there were essentiall *possession*.

P. 34. 1.
Answer
p. 24.

of the *English* *Translator* god and man, and the *English* *Translator*

THE 2. DIALOGVE.

§

ons. Thus vnawares you destroy that you build. But to let this goe. Would you then finde possession there descrybed, where was no vie of any such thinge? Surely you were sick of a superfluity of Hebrewes, and except you had *Timely* vented it in this place, you had certainly dyed for it.

Where you say, No true Interpreter did ever translate *Demonizomenos*, men essentially possessed with diuels inherently in them, Indeed men usually are loath in translation to render so many words for one. But neyther say you is it so understood of the most iudiciall & soundest diuines. You might haue donne well to haue produced the authorities of some, and to haue spared your former ydle and vnauory flourish, with your greeke and hebrew. Calvin saith, *When Demoniacks doe speake the diuels speake in them, & by them.* Again, *It foloweth that the diuel hath an habitation in men, because he is thence driven out of the soule of G. d. Beza* termeth the dispossession of diuels, *A casting of them out of the bodies of men.* Now then whether these wordes, I o haue dyuels speake in them and by them, the diuel to haue an habitation in men, to haue diuels cast out of the bodies of men, founde rather a real inherency, or the contrary, Let any indiffeient man iudge. Peter Martyr speaks thus: *Christ & the Apostles commaunded the diuels, that they should go out of the bodies possessed.* Piscator affirmeth, *that god sometimes permitteth vncleane spirits to dwell in man.* He saith further: *The misery of the childe is set forth, by the inhabiting of the diuel.* And Zanchius proues this inherency by sundry reasons. It were long to alleadge all: and we shall haue more occasion afterwards. Therefore eyther shewe vs the words of the most iudiciall Diuines, by which it may either expressly appeare, or at least be soundly gathered, that there is no substantiall inbeing of diuels in Demoniacks, or els be ashamed to face out an vntruth thus impudently in the open view of the world.

The second generall poynt disputeth, whether it be necessary Sathan should first enter essentially into the possessed mans mind, before he can possibly bring the body into his slavish subiection: which poynt you determine negatively, making to your selfe an aduersary of straw to fight withall, I neuer hauing affirmed any such thing. For my part I knowe the body may most violently be tormented by Sathan, when the minde the meane while vpheld by the grace of god, doth not yealde vnto him. yet you proceede in this needelesse businesse, and frame an obiection out of theis words, *And after the sopp Sathan entred into him.* This entrance say you is only an effectuell thrusting of the intended treason into Iudas his heart. I will not dispute whether this entrance was substantiall, or no: (*Augustine* is of opinion it was not, but only a further degree of efficacy moving Iudas, whereto I consent) for this makes little

pag. 48

in
Luc. 4: 11.

in
Math. 12: 43

in
Mat. 12: 26.

loc. com:
claus. 1: cap.
10. sect. 30:
mach. 8, 28,
mar 9,

pag. 42

Iohn 13: 27

de consens
Evang. lib
3: cap. 3

to the matter in hand. *Judas* is no where termed a *Demoniack*, of whom only our question is, neyther in truth may be counted one. For *Judas* betrayd not his maister ignorantly, or vpon meere compulsion but through the voluntary mallice of his owne hart inflamed by the power of *Sathan*. So concerning *Ananias*, of whom it is said, *the diuel had filled his heart*, Though this entrance were not reall, yet this cause is neuer the worse. considering the question is not, how the diuel doth enter by suggestion, but by possession, in which state *Ananias* was not. Therefore cease to encomber your Reader with vnnecessary talke, and either bring something to purpose, or houlde your peace. Next comes *Physiologus* in, and reasons very properly, but that he beates the anvil, not once striking the hot yron. The conclusion is, *The bodie may be in slavish subiection to Sathan, before the minde it self be subdued*: which if it be vnderstood of violent subiection, I haue already graunted: but *Physiologus* will needes also haue it true in voluntary subiection, as if there could be a willing obedience without the commaund of the will. But what is his reason? *The bodie may be tempted externally, before the minde be subdued*. And this poynt because we doubted not of it, is proued by two whole pages. But what? Is all temptation before the minde be subdued a slavish subiection? Heere *Physiologus* is altogether mute: he spent all his goates wooll in makinge his other web, and hath not left himself one locke, to worke vp this peece with.

The third generall poynt is, *whether the diuel doth essentially enter into any mans mind*: which question I might well let passe, as little perreyning to this cause of ours. VVe only haue witnessed Gods greate goodnes towards certaine his servants in deliueringe them from the greuous rage of *sathan*: but whether this vexation proceeded from his reall dwelling in the minde, or no, we haue not taken vpon vs to discusse. It was ynough for vs to behould the flame, and the Lord in mercy quenching it, although we be not priuy from what fornace yt arose. Yet because you haue propounded it, and that it is worthy consideration, (so we conteine our selues within the boundes of christian sobriety,) I will say somethinge in regarde both of the Reader, and my selfe, desyrous rather to learne, and to finde out the truth, then presuminge to conclude any thing peremptorily: for what neede we, saith *Augustine* define any such thing with danger, wherof we may be ignorant without blame? I answer therefore, the diuel doth not enter essentially into the minde, that reasonable faculty of the soule, which comprehendeth the vnderstanding and will. *The Lord only knoweth the hearts of all the children of men*. Neither yet doe I affirme that spirits doe really enter into the soules inferior powers and operations,

actes 5:36

pag:43

pag:43

Aug. enchiridion
ad Laurentium
cap. 59

1 kings 8:39

THE 2. DIALOGVE.

3

as Quickning, Sense, Affection: only this I say, that after an hyden and ynserchable manner they doe apply and ioynethemselues to these her inferiour workes. *Gennadius* consentinge with *Bernard Augustine* & *Beda* that the diuel doth not essentially enter into the minde, yet affirmeth that by an effectual application, and a violent oppression he is nerely vnited vnto it. VVhat els is this application, & neere vnion vnto the minde, but the ioyning of himselfe to the phantasy and affections, the next neighbors to the vnderstandinge & will? So *Bernard* requireth the entercourse of some instrument, whereby created Spirits might be applyed to the minde, that is, the Imaginations & affections, which be instrumentall, and by which they doe exceedingly worke vpon the highest powers in our nature.

Bernard Ser.
5. super Can
Aug. de SP,
et Anima
cap. 27
Beda in Act:
5.3.
Gennad. in
definit. eccle
sie dogmat.
Bernard Ser.
5. Super can
tic.
Aug. de diu
nat. demon:
cap. 5.

And *Augustine* is most plaine avouchinge, that *Diuels* perswade by maruelous and inuisible meanes, by their subtilty peering into the bodies of men, not at all perceauing the, & mingling themselves with their cogitations by certain imaginarie sights, whether they be waking or sleeping. But this is principally confirmed by the scriptures themselves, for that angels making their apparitions in sleepe, performe their operations immediatly. The outward fences at such time are all bound, so that by them they can not conuey any thing from without, to the powers within. Example we haue in *Ioseph*, to whome an angell appeared in sleepe, bidding him not feare to take *Mary* his wife. And as this Angell did speake in *Ioseph*, so it might seeme the Angell which talked with *Zachary*, did speake in *Zachary*, as the naturall force of the word doth signify. And the Angell, saith he, which talked in me.

Math. 1. 20.
Zach. 1. 9 &
2. 3.
Zach. 1. 8

This vision made to *Zachary* was in the night, for so he saith, I saw by night. And this manner of speech, to see by night, or to see night visions, is all one to see a dreame. For so *Daniell* speaketh, I sawe, saith he, by night visions, when as before he had declared it was by dreame, *Daniell saw a dreame, and there were visions in his head*, hee lying vpon his bed. Therefore *Augustine* had good reason to dispute of this place of *Zachary* as he did, considering Night apparitions, the force of the originall word, and the greeke interpreters so care fully expressing it, notwithstanding whatsoever these men say to the contrary. Besides, experience also giueth no small light to this matter. It must needes be that wicked & horrible cogitations, such as make a man euen to tremble for feare, should eyther arise from the corruption of the flesh, or from some outward cause, or else from the reall presence of some wicked spirit mouing the phantasy. But the flesh is no author of such horroir, which by all meanes it escheweth affording rather all flattering and intising allurements to perswade the minde by: neither is there any outward cause or occasion, wher

Dan. 7. 13
Dan. 7. 1.

Pag. 59.

by

by the thoughts should be so greuously assaulted, as is apparant in
 ciuersio afflicted: It remaynein then they be stirred vp by the per
 sonall preience only of him, which if he be manfully withstood by
 faith will fly away. This I take to be the truth in this poynt: war-
 ranted both from the scriptures, and from consent of cheifest inter-
 pretors. If these things now be so, though you should demonstrate
 the diuell doth not euter really into the minde, yet if he be so nere
 the phantasie & other inferiour parts, he will be found to be with-
 in a mile of him whome he doth possesse, and you to haue powred
 forth a great company of big wordes to small purpose.

RAM: 8

pag. 46, 47,

Mat. 25: 34
 Rom. 8: 36,

If I desired to shew, how when you haue a good cause you
 handle it full yll, I might fitly doe it heere. That *there is no mentall*
possession, you proue thus, *The diuells, as also mans minde, are crea-*
ted of god for other more speciall ends. As if things destinated to some
 principall end, may not in meane season be vied to other inferiour
 purposes. The elect are appointed to be heires of the kingdome,
 yet in this world they be as the sheepe of the slaughter. Indeeed if
 you had shewed that god neuer purposed any such thing, you had
 laid somewhat. Againe say you, *The real entrance into the spirits of*
men, doth obscure the peculiar office of the holy ghost, which is (reple-
ty) to inhabite in our hearts for ever. If any sholde affirme such entrace
 he would not be so mad as to say, that spirits were there *repletiuely*.
 Seeing then there is no equality of their inbeing, (supposing such
 a thing) it doth no more obscure his office, then the light of a can-
 dle the cleare sun-shine. Further you say, *whereas there be three ma-*
ners only of inbeing essentially, none of all these doth agree to the in-
ing of wicked spirits. I answer, (to admit this inherency for this pre-
 sent dispute) they be there *definitiuely*. Then, say you, *they are*
only there in conceit. what say you? are diuells in the Aer but only
 in conceyt? are they any other waies there then *definitiuely*? This
 conceyt of yours makes diuells but a meere fancy. I thought you
 had ment good sooth in your first dialogue: but such counterbuffs
 as this would make one beleue, you are priuately of other iudg-
 ment, whatsoeuer there you pretend. Norwithstanding these and
 other such like reasons of yours, (which for breuity I omit) the di-
 uel may possesse the soule of man, as well as his body. Such acute
 disputers are ye. It is no maruaile though you maintayne your
 bad cause as you doe, when you mannage a good no better.

A Survey of the third Dialogue.

The third Dialogue handles two conclusions: The first, *That*
spirits & diuels doe not enter essentially into the possessed mans bodie.
 The second, *That they haue no true naturall bodies for this purpose.*

peculiar

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

7

peculiar to themselves: importing a necessity of naturall bodies for a reall entrance: A thing most absurd.

That spirits doe enter really into mens bodies, we haue partly heard, but it is more euidēt by that which followeth. They present themselves to the phantasy without mediation of any outward sense: not by way of influence, themselves being absent, as the sunne abidinge in the heauens pearceth with his beames to the earth: by personall presence therefore, which is required in their actions: For which cause they be *Angels*, that is, *Reporters*, sent forth to the *ministry*, as the example of *Gabriel* sent to *Daniel* & *Mary* declare.

Againe they which dealt with familiar spirits, are tearmed by the 70. Interpretours *Engastrimythi*, that is, such as speake after an extraordinary manner out of their bellies: not as if they had a drum by their sides, but from a reall being of a spirit in them. For so it is said concerning them, If a man or a woman haue a spirit of diuination, or soothsayinge in them &c. Of whome *Theodoret* speaketh thus: Some by certaine diuels being swollen in their bellies deceiued many of the simple, as foretelling (sooths) things to come, which the Grecians terme *Bowel-propheets*, for that the diuel seemed to speake from within them: Vnto whome *Aristophanes* alludeth. But imitating (saith he) the soothsaying & wisdom of *Euricles*, by entering into other mens bellies, I haue poured forth many poore comickall things. Vpon which wordes the *Scholiast* writeth thus. This *Euricles* was a Belly-speaker, & was reported at *Athens* to haue prophesied many true things by a diuell that was within him. Afterwards this manner of spirit was called *Pythia*, as *Th. Beza* witnesseth vpon the 16. Chapter of the *Actes* v. 16. where you may see more to this purpose. Besides, it is playne, that they which be possessed, are carried by an inward moouer, & not by a thing forcing them outwardlie. All outward violence, as if one be drawne, or thrust forward, hath a resistance in the bodie. but men possessed cut themselves with *stones*, cast themselves into the fire, & into the water, and runne to their owne destruction most greedely, as also the swine did hauing receaued these guests: wherevpon the Primitiue Church fitly called them *Engurgumēni*, as hauing the verie reall fountaine of this operation within them. But cheeflie it is to be remembred, that in the Gospell the diuell is said to (a) enter into men: to be (b) in them, to (c) dwell in them, and whē these men (whome we call *Demoniacks*) were healed, to (d) come or go out of them, to be (e) cast or throwne out, and to be (f) driven out: (g) *Goe out of him* (saith *Christ*) and enter no more into him: Then

C

the

*Math. 7, 10,
Heb. 1, 14.*

*in Leui: 19,
Engastru-
meni,
Aristoph.
in uespis,*

*mar: 5, 13a
& 9, 22,*

(a) Luk. 11,
26:
(b) Mat. 19
16:
c Mat. 12,
45:
(d) Math: 12
43, & 17, 22
Lu. 9, 41, 5
41
(e) Math, 7
22 & 10, 1
8
(f) Marke 3
23.
(g) Marke 2
25

the spirit came out. Again (i.) Hold thy peace, & come out of him: then the Diuel came out of him. And againe, (i.) Come out of the man, thou vncleane spirit. Heerevpon the diuels besought Iesus, saying: If thou cast vs out, suffer vs &c. Then the vncleane spirit went out, & entred in to the swine. Where therefore the Discomfers say, there be no proper words or termes in any of the places of Scripture concerning Demoniacks expressing an essentiall possession, the falshood thereof is so manifest, that it may be seene with ones forehead. For what words or termes can possibly be more proper, direct, & plaine, to expresse the inherency of spirits in Demoniacks then these vsed by the holy ghost? It is written that after Christs resurrection many dead bodies arose, & came out of the graues, and appeared vnto many. Is it not heereby manifest, that those dead bodies had bene buried, and layd in graues? In the 10. of Luke we reade that the Samaritane hauing carried the man that was robbed betweene Ierusalem and Iericho to an Inne, tooke out (viz. of his purse) two pence and gaue them to the host, sayinge that whatsoeuer he should spend wth e, he would recompence. I woulde know now of M. Deacon and M. Walker, whether these two pence were not once in the Samaritans purse. And whether if they were neuer in his purse, it is possible he should take them out of his purse. In like sort S. Marke speaking of Mary Magdalen, saith, that out of her Iesus cast seauen diuels. And Luke that out of her went seauen dwells. I demaund now whether seauen diuels were not first in her, before they went out of her. This egress of the spirit (so often mentioned in the gospell) doth evidently proue the ingresse and inherency of the spirit. Yet the holy ghost resteth not heere, but doth in as plaine & expresse wordes affirme the ingresse, and the inherencie of the spirit, as the egress thereof. The ingresse is set downe in these words; enter no more into him. Also he commeth with seauen worse then himselfe, and they enter in. The inherencie in the words following, and they dwell there. Likewise in that Demoniacks are said, to haue a diuell. But chiefly and most plainly this appeareth by the 19. of the Acts where Luke mentioning the wounding of the seauen sonnes of Sceua, saith, And the man in whom the euill spirit was, ran on them, & ouercame them. These things must now needs be Reall, except we will haue a man to enter into an house, which comes no nearer then the dore: to dwell and be in it, and yet neuer come vnder the rooffe: and to be throwne out, though he was neuer within. If one shoulde charge you M. Deacon that you were throwne out of Ireland, how would you defend your selfe? were it not sufficient to shewe you were

h. mar. 9. 25.

i. mar. 9. 17.

mat. 9. 31.

pag. 3438.

Mar. 27, 52.

Mark. 16. 9.

Luke, 8. 2

mark. 9. 25.

mat. 12. 45.

Luk 4:33: &

3. 27.

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

9

were neuer in *Ireland*: So if the ciuill could truly affirme, he was neuer in any mans bodie, he would thinke he had no small advantage against the Gospell, that proues him so oft to be *throwne out*. I beseech you let him be his owne *Proctor*, and doe not you helpe him with a shift, whereby he might inueigle anie.

As this inherencie of spirits in *Demoniacks* is cleered by the holy scriptures, so hath the same in all ages bene receaued for a truth, as appeareth by the testimonies of learned writers here followinge.

Tertullian saith, It is not hard for the diuels to get into our bodies. *Againe*. We expell diuels out of men, as is knowne to many. These spirits saith *Cyprian*, disquiet our sleepe, and secretly also creeping into the bodies terrify the minde, distort the members, &c. *Augustine* affirmeth, that the diuels are tormented, and cast out of the bodies of men possessed.

Againe, that through their subtilty they can pence into the bodies of men when they perceauie them not. *Theophilact* writeth thus: The Lord doth aske him his name, not that he himself but others should learne the multitude of diuels that were in him. Men know not saith *Aquinas*, when the diuel speaketh in them, what they speake. *Peter Martyr* reasoninge against the papists exorcising in baptisme, hath these wordes: Seeing these Exorcists be not able to drive vncleane spirits out of them in whom it is not doubted but that they are: why babble they, that they cast them out of them, in whom they shew no signe of their presence? *Calvin* saith,

why a legyon dwelt in one man, is not for vs to enquire. Beza thus: Not of euery erection of diuells out of the bodies of men may thus be affirmed which Christ beere concludeth: seeing by *Coumans* saiban may easily suffer himself to be cast forth of the bodies, that he might the more easily raigne in the soules of men. Sometimes (saith *Chemnicus*) wicked spirits god permitting them, homines ingrediuntur, doe enter into men, and doe so possesse them, that they dwell in them, abusinge their members after their will. *Danaus* saith, fasting I exorcise to prayer, but not to the man possessed, as though by the scarcity of victuals and want of meate, sibi inbecutem *Demonem* expellat, i.e. should expell the diuel inherent in him. For diuels in *Demoniacks* are not fed with meate. *Againe*, the diuels in the bodies of men haue spoken. *Chirens* giueth this definition of possession, that it is an affliction of the body deliuered into the power of *Sathan*, where by both the body is *ruined*, and of *Sathan* imbalued, and the actions of the members gouerned not of the minde only, but partly also by the vncleane spirit. *Againe* saith he: As spirits be in a place definitiue, so a diuel, or more, occupy the body deliuered vp to their power; meaninge that they are definitiue in those bodies. that is, they be in them,

Term in
Apul. cap. 13
Cyprian: de
Idoluanita-
te

Aug. lib. de
ciuit. Dei 8.
in fine capi-
tis 26.

Aug. de di-
demon. cap. 1.
in Man. 5: 7.
Th Aquinas
q. 165. art. 3
arg. 4.

Lo com. cla-
4: cap. 9, sect
16.

17 Mar. 5, 9,
in Mat. 12 26

Chem. Har.
lib. 1 cap. 17.
pag 70
in Ma. 9:
29. quelt 18:

Dan. de for-
tariis,
Chy in Math.
2. 18

disfranchisement

Out of
the fits the
actions of
Demoniacks
be giuened
in the
mid, in their
fits & the
fo Diuel.

De operib.
cre. part 1
lib 4 cap 10

so that they be not any where else. See further in *Chytr. us. Zanchi-*
us hath these wordes. *Sathan doth so invade vs, vt in nostra etiam pe-*
nitent et ingrediatur corpora, that he doth peince & enter into our bodies,
and doth diuersly affect the same within. I see not why we should not say
substantia sua illos ingredi, that they doe in their substance enter into
them. And after some arguments to proue this, that they doe sub-
stantia sua manere in hominibus, in their substance or essence abide in
men: he concludeth thus: These things shew that diuels haue bene with
in vs such kinde of men: and moued them hither and thither, as agents in
ternall, not externall. Piscator vpon these wordes Luke 8. 2. and cer-
taine women which he had healed of euill spirits, saith: *a, hic notat ad-*
iunctionem inherens. This preposition of, noteth here the adiunct in herēt.
VVhereby it is euident that he houldeth the inherency of spirits in de-
moniacks. Otho Casman maketh his entrance to his treatise of possel-
sion thus. There remaineth to be treated of, the entring of diuels into
the bodies of men & possession. He proceedeth. Possession is an action of
the diuel, wherein the diuel entring into the body of man doth possesse it,
and exercise vpon it the power receaued to hurt and torment it. The par-
tes of possession be two: the ingresse of the spirit; the exercising of the pow-
er that is graunted. The ingresse is, whereby the diuel first entrech into the
body, and hauing entred doth possesse it. and is in it. And handlinge
this question how or after what manner diuels be in men: he resol-
ueth it thus: we say that they be in them indeed: even personally. For
further confirmation of this inherency you haue *Clement. 2. lib. 2.*
pag. 502. Doct. 7. Cap. 8. Minutius in Octauio. Dionysius Carthagi-
anus in Luc. 4. 35. et in Matth. 8. 28. Scultetus in Medulla theol.
patrū. pag. 55. Luther in Matth. 8. 28. Erasmi annot. in Act. Apo.
19. 16. Gualther in Mar. 5. 1. Brentius in Mar. 5. 9. Bucer in Mat.
17. 21. Ph. Melancthon lib. Epistolarū. Bullinger: Decad. 5. Ser. 3.
Marturat in Mar. 3. 15. Musc. in Matth. 12. 27. 43. D. Fulke his
answer to the Rhem. Test. Marb. 17. 21.

Answers
pag 17, 18
& 341.

Dialog Dis-
cussio to
the Reader
pag. 1:
P 8 199

By the premisses, not only the falshood, but the blasphemy
of these men doth manifestly appeare: who feare not to call this
said doctrine of inherencie of Sathan in Demoniacks, an *absurd &*
senslesse opinion, and to reject it, as fond and frivolous. Hereby also
doth appeare their notorious impudency, in that notwithstandinge
the premisses (whereof they cannot be altogether ignorant, special-
ly if they haue ansa^l so many libraries as they affirme they haue)
they stick not to say, that if the seuerall writings of the most iudiciall &
soundest Diuines be exactly considered, we shall finde, that not any one
of

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

ff

of them all doe vnderstand by *Demon iacks*, any such persons as are essentially possessed with a diuill inuolently in them. Why I my self haue heretofore shewed the contrary, out of *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Chrysostome*, *Peter Martyr*, *Philip Melancthon*, *Beza*, *Vogelinus*, and *Danicens*, as appeareth by the *Doctrine*. You might well therefore haue omitted these wordes, vntill you had returned answer to thole testimonies, and likewise haue reitrayned to say that the essentiall possession of deuils is only a devise & dreame of my owne. But it may in no case be forgotten, that whiles you tell vs all sound Diuines are on your side, and not so much as one with vs, you produce not a sentence out of sound or vnsound Diuine: so as if we will beleue what you say, we must take it of your word, which no wise man will doe. *Wher* euery one it cometh that ye are so barren heere in the allegations of *Scripture* and new writers, who so abound therein else where: we may easily correcture. Now *Baxter*, *Calvin*, *Marlorat*, *Quaer* & *Beza*, whome you coate in the margin, as Diuines on your side, be not with you but against you, it is plaine by that is aforesaid. *Wher* in we may be somewhat confirmed by their silence, but more by goinge to the places ye your selues haue quoted.

La 11., it diu't haue no such meaning in the possessed, surely some writer of account concerning the letter of the scripture is so plaine for it, and the generall mistake of all former ages, would in his exposition haue admonished the Reader least he should stumble at these words in taking them literally. But I finde no such caution in any, that (searching) I haue seene, till Mr. *Deacon* and Mr. *Walker* now after sixteen hundredeth yeares haue timely put vs in minde thereof. Only *Peter Lombard* saith, it is not so perspicuous whether they entered really, or no. But this was his schoole fashion: to finde a knot in a bulrush. Yet hee doth not resolve of the matter. But it may be these smart disputers haue found out that, wherein the skill and learning of all other haue fayled. I let vs therefore weigh their reasons, when first we haue heard their answer to our forelaide maie reason taken from the gospel.

Wher as the letter of *entering in*, of dwelling, of casting out is vrged these men shift of the places thus, *They are not to be construed according to the letter*. why so? Because the Lord saith, *And I will enter in vnto him. And againe, and we will come vnto him & dwell with him: which are not to be vnderstood of an essentiall entrance.*

I answer, your boldnes is exceeding great. who vpon so slender a foundation durst presume to depart from the euident wordes

C 2

of the

pag. 55. 56.
57. 58

Ans. pag. 33

pro. 14. 15.

go. 14. 15.

Sent. lib. 3.
dist. 3. q. 4

Reu. 3. 20.
Ioh. 1. 33

of the scripture, so frequently used without any change. Because the Lord saith I will enter, and yet doth not enter essentially, doth it thereupon follow, that also diuels where it is said they doe enter, should not enter essentially? Is there the like reason of the infinite and of finite spirits? God being euery where cannot be saide to enter but figuratiuely, but in the creature, which entreth by chaunging place, it is alwaies proper: except we can shew necessary reason to the contrary. By as good cōsequence you might proue that *Aaron* the high preist neuer entered into the tabernacle of the congregation essentially. The Lord commaunded the *Israhelites* to make a tabernacle for him, that he might dwell amongst them. And *Dauid* will leaue beeing lasting doores to lift vp their heads, that the king of glory might enter in. But say you, the King of glory did neuer enter in essentially, and therefore where it is said that *Aaron* went into the tabernacle, it is by your leaden rule, to be taken that he went not in corporally. Such foolery if it might be suffered wold make the scripture a noise of wax, if men might reiect the letter vpon euery such absurd fancy. It irkes me to spend time in reproouinge such doctage.

Exod 25:9,
Plat 24:7,9

But you say, *Sathans* entring into *Indas*, (*Iob*. 13. 27.) which is the same manner of speech, is nothing else but that *Sathan* did dart or thrust the treaon into his heart.

I reply as before. *Indas* was not a *Demoniack*, and therefore this example fittes not the purpose. It is not necessary the same speech in suggestion, and possession should import the same thing, it being proper to the one and figurative to the other. But if you can shew vs a possession which was effected by darting only cogitations into the heart, we will yeald vnto you that these wordes of entring & dwelling imply no real inbeing. This is in effect that you say. These words, entring into *Iob*. 13. 27. are not to be understood literally, therefore in the Scriptures concerning *Demoniacks*, the said wordes are not to be understood literally. By this reason, *Christ* entred not into *Capernaum*, as it is said he did *Math*. 8. 5. Neither entred he in to a ship, as it is said *Math*. 8. 13. Neither entred *Mary* into the house of *Zacharias*, as it is writtten *Luk*. 1. 40. But some spiritual and mistifical thing is in these places to be understood by the words, entred into: for to make this an argument you must haue this for your proposition: These words entring into wherfoeuer they be found in scripture, are not to be construed according to the letter. Now this proposition I will be so bould as to deny, and put you to the prooffe.

prooffe thereof in your next learned Discourse.

You goe on further in your answer thus. *Wherefoerer the Scripture: Speake of the diuel his euing in, & going out of the parties possessed, they speake it only by Metaphore.* And this you proue by Mark. 1. 23. which place you shew at large cannot be taken in the literall sence.

After this manner (indeed) you argue. *One place of Scripture concerning Demoniacks, viz. Mark. 1. 23. can not be taken in the literall sence, but metaphoricallie: therefore no scripture concerning Demoniacks.* Shall I instead of further reply proceede to reason after your manner? Thus then will I reason. Diuers places of Scripture concerning Christ, can not be vnderstood literally, but metaphorically: therefore none. Or thus, Christ is said to be a dore, a vine, *ergo* Christ was not borne of a virgine, crucified &c. *Herod* was a * fox, therefore not a king. *Nero* a * Lyon: therefore not a man. But supposig these wordes of *euering in*, and *going out*, wherefoerer in holy scripture they haue relation to the diuel, were not to be vnderstood literally, are they therefore to be taken *metaphoricallie*, as euery where you tell vs? No verily. There were a plaine *metonymie* of the effect, and not a *metaphore*. And considering you vse the worde *effectually* so of ten, and that you say oft, that *this going out*, and *euering in* of the diuel, must be vnderstood of an *effectuall* and *powerfull* operation: methinks if you were so great clarkes, as you seeme to your selues, & to some poore soules in the world: you should one time or other haue be thought you of this error, which a scholler at the gramer schole would quickly corre^r. If you will needes haue here a *metaphore*, I pray you let it hereafter be made to appcare, with his *protasis* and *apodosis*: that so we may conceaue this hidden metaphor. But *Orthodoxus* leaueh not heere. And thus I say further, (quoth he) that you can not poss^{bly} alledge throughout the whole Scriptures, any one text, wherein either *Angels* or *Spirits*, or *diuels* &c otherwise spoken of then only by *metaphore*. What? Is euery Scripture of this kinde *metaphoricall*? why you your selues doe tell vs. that where in Luk. 4. 35. a man is said to haue a *spirit* of an *unclean diuel*, that by *spirit* we must vnderstande *his impuls^{ion}*, *motion*, or *inspiration* of the *spirit*. According to which sence, say you, the worde *spirit* is vsually obserued both in the olde and new testament. And for confirmation thereof you alledge Dan. 4. 5. 6. & 5. 11, 12. Ren. 16. 24. In these places then there is a *metonymie*, as euery boy can tell you, and not a *metaphor*. Again, where *Sathan* is said to *enter into Iudas*, that is, suggest or thrust.

Answer page 15. and 21,

Answer page 17
How Marke 1. 23. is to be expounded, it is euident by comparing it with Luke 4. 23, & with Acts 19. 16. As also by confering Mark 5. 2. with Luke 8. 27.
Ioh. 10. & 15
Luke 13. 32,
1 Tim. 4. 17.

page 66

Ans. page 15

Answers page 20, 21

Ioh 13. 27

trust the intended treason into him, another text alleadged & expounded by your selves: who teach not that this is spoken *metonymically*, and not *metaphorically*. In the title of the *Actes* it is said of *Ananias*, that *satan filled his heart*. This *filling*, say you, in page 48, was *effectually*. Here then likewise is a *metonymy*, well metonymic or metaphore, or whatsoever it is, this they are very sure of, that it is not possible to shew any one place of scripture, wherein that which is spoken of *Angel*, or *devil*, is to be interpreted *literally*. Nor what say you to *Heb 1, 14* where it is said, they are *ministering spirits*, sent forth to minister for the sake, which shall be *heires of salvation*. And concerning devils, these places must needs be understood according to the letter. *Satan provoked David to number Israel*. The devil hath been a murderer from the beginning, and abideth in the truth, because there is no truth in him. when he speaketh a lie, then speaketh he of his own, for he is a liar. The devils believe & tremble. All the times being taught *Jesus*. *Jesus* was 40. dayes tempted of the devil. The devil saide, if thou be the sonne of God &c. The devil let him on a pinnacle of the temple. The Angels sunned on cast down into hell, to be kept in bondage until the judgement of the great day. Hereunto many more places might be added, but these suffice to shew that many the great speak of spirits are to be understood according to the very letter, and to be without controversy, in particular the places to be interpreted concerning the devils entering into *Demoniacks*, & going out of them: a matter standing whatsoever these vaine ianglers, (which would be Doctors, & yet understand not what they speake neither whereof they affirm) prattle to the contrary. Which iangling of theirs is very ealie, to be retelled, by the rules which I have shewed, when the scriptures are figuratively to be understood, and when not figuratively, but properly. Then namely are they to be understood figuratively, when the sense, which the very words taken according to the proper signification sound, agreeth not with other scripture, and with the analogy of faith: but is rather repugnant to the holy scriptures. On the other side, properly, when it doth not repugne. Now to what testimonies of the scripture, is this entering in, and goinge out repugnant, being literally understood? what scripture is there that contrarieth this *ingress*, *ingress*, and goinge out of the spirit we speake of? To the former rule let vs adde this other of *Augustine*. When any thing (saith he) is found in the Scripture, which cannot with out an absurdity be possibly interpreted literally: that thing without doubt is spoken figuratively, & must receive some

1 Chro. 11.
Ioh 8 44,
James 2 19,
mar 5 12,
Luc 4,
2 Pet 2 4
1 Iude 6,

Zanchius de
o, crib, rede
p. 8. 66

Ad Gen. li:
11, ca P. 1.

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

15

some other signification, then the bare letter doth seeme to import: and otherwise accordinge to the letter, for that is to be vnderstood. But from this said literall interpretation, there can arise no absurdity, therefore not a figuratiue, but the literall interpretation is heere to be receaued.

But you proceede in your answer saying: that we must not so strictly tie our selues to the obseruation of words: *else, how will we vnderstand this Scriptures The good spirit of the Lord departed from Saule: & an euil spirit of the Lord came vpon him. And so ye goe on sumbling the second time about an equall manner of entring by the holy spirit, and the bad. If Saule was possided with an euil spirit (say you) when the euil spirit of the Lord came vpon him, then also was he really possid with the good spirit of god when he was anointed King, because it was so promised, That the spirit of the Lord should come vpon him.*

pag 67
132. 16, 14.

1. Sam 10, 6
102

I answer first, that Saule was no Demoniack. Secondiy, I haue sufficiently shewed your grossenes in attributinge a like manner of entring to God the infinite spirit, and to the wicked angel a finite creature. The good spirit being euery where, commeth vpon a man, by causing his graces more to appeare, and to sprout forth in him: the euil spirit being of a limited nature, and therefore abent from one place, when he is in another, comes vpon and into a man, not by influence and intigation properly, but by personall & reall presence. This considered your hebrew is to no purpose, page 68. as also that, which you no lesse falsly then tediously avouch in the next page, wherein you match the good and euil spirit together in a felt same manner of entring into men. Thus much for replie to the answer you giue to the aforesaid maine argument prouing a reall possession. Let vs now examine your reasons, whereby you goe about to ouerthrow the same, and to proue, that the diucl did neuer really enter into, & inherently dwell in the possided mans bodie.

First you say, That there be no proper wordes or termes in any of the places of Scripture concerning Demoniacks, expressing an essentiall possession: which the holy ghost wanted not if he had euery purposed to express such a matter. For neither the hebrew word achuzzah, nor ierushah, nor ierushah, morashah, nor the greke word Etema, which is ordinarily obserued in the new testament to set forth possession by, as the other be in the olde, are used in any of the places of Scripture concerning Demoniacks: therefore there be no proper wordes or termes in any of the places of scripture concerning Demoniacks expressing an essentiall possession.

pag 69. & an
swered page
65. 48.
Their first ar
gument agai
nst reall poi
session,
pag 34: 35-

Ans

I deny the argument. For there may be, nay there are other wordes and that very often vsed by the holy ghost, in those scriptures which concerne Demoniacks, that manifestly declare the *inbeing* of the spirit in Demoniacks: which these wordes, signifying possession, nor any of the same significatio doe not, had the same bene vsed by the holy ghost. Doe I any where, ye *Discouersers*, or yet any man else, gon about to proue the *inbeing* of the spirit in Demoniacks, from our English translation, and from the teignes of *possessum* and *possesit*. Surely neither my selfe, nor yet any other of meane vnderstanding euer doted so much. For first I know very wel, that the word in the Original signifieth neither possession, nor possessed. Secondly, admit it did, it were very absurd from thence to conclude this *inbeing* of the spirit. A man may be possessed of an house, though he be not in it. So might the diuell be posselt of a man, albeit he were not in him: if there were nothing else to proue the *inbeing* of *Sathan* in men possessed. Whereby the Vanitie of this *Propositiue* doth notably appeare: and that these men keepe much ado about raoneshine in the waters. Their leaues consumed about the asps of possession and possesit, seruing to no other purpose, but to prayme their great skill (forsooth) in the hebrew & greek tongues. As for our English translators, they in translating the word *Demonizomenoi*, in latin *Demonizati*, possessed with diuels, did not respect so much the propriety of the word, as the condition of Demoniackes, and to explaine that word, by shewing (in parte) what a Demoniacke is. And from hence it is that the wordes possession and possessed haue bene vsed by Cyprian, Chrysostome, Augustine, and generally all auncient and latter writers vntill this day. Not to note the *inbeing* of the spirits in Demoniacks, (which neede not) as theis fanglers fondly pretend, but to shew that the diuell houldeth in his dominion or power the bodies of Demoniackes, as a man doth that which he posselleth.

From this argument they proceede further to argue against reall possession vnder certaine foolish and vnlearned questions: & Orthodoxus being out of breath, Physilogus starts vp in his place, and proues it by good senselesse reason. Doe you imagine (saith he) that the Lord euer propounded any such ende to himselfe in the creation of bodies?

Thus might one reaso against that saying of the Apostle 1. Cor. 6. 15. Also against the torment the bodies of the damned shall endure in hell. Doe you imagine, the Lord euer propounded to himselfe any such

Cyprian Do
miti tract. 1.
Chrysostom
Tom. 5 de in
compre. Dei
natu. hom. 4.
Aug. lib. 8.
de Ciuit. Dei
cap. 36.

Arg. 2.
pag. 70.
75. 76. and
341.
Answe.

THE 3. DIALOGVE.

17

such end in the creation of bodies? They will answer, the Lord did not propound any such end, but man brought them vpon him by sinne. Euen so doe I. Man by his sinne bringeth (sometimes) that body of his to be a receptacle and habitation for the vncleane spirit, which otherwise should be the habitation of God, and temple for the holy ghost to dwell in.

But goe so, (saith he) What becometh of the soules all the while the diuel is in the body? Remaines the soule still in that body, or is it utterly expelled, & thrust out of the same?

Argu. 9.
Pag. 702

It remaines still in the body. In a swound the soule is in the body, though it doe not shew itselfe in her animall and organall operations. Euen so in this case, the soule is in the Demoniacks bodie, though in his fits, not his spirit, but the vncleane spirit, shew it selfe by the effects.

Answer

This naturalist goeth on thus. If there be a reall possession, then the soule during the time of the possession, shall not be accountable for any those peculiar actions of the bodie, which it neuer directed the bodie vnto, nor gave consent vnto.

Arg. 4.
Pag. 73, 74 &
341.

This is cunninglie done of you, that in the last iudgment you can diuide the bodie & the soule asunder, that each may giue account for their seuerall actions apart. Secondly, your proposition is very childish. VVhat if the diuel force the tongue to blasphemy? what if he abuse the other members to all villany? Shall not the creature which hath bene deseruedly yealded vp into the power of the aduersary, be guiltie that it hath bene an abused instrument to the creators dishonour? We may remember heere, that the diuels instrument in deceauing Eua, receaued therefore punishment from the Lord. If you had weighed these thinges, you had bridleed your selues from much idle talks.

Ans

Gen. 3:14

Their fyft argument followeth. The diuel needeth no reall possession in any mans bodie, therefore he doth not really possesse any mans bodie.

Arg. 5
Pag. 75

I answer your friuolous argument with the like. The diuel needeth none of your actuall possession, therefore he neuer possessed any actually, which you say sometimes he did. The diuel needeth not to tempt men: therefore he doth not tempt any.

Answer:

But you say, The diuel neuer receaued longer commission against any mans bodie, then against Iobs, or yet was not he essentially possessed, therefore there was neuer any possessed essentiallie.

Argu. 6
Pag. 76

This argument halteth on the right leg, and is like to this:

Ans.

Lab

Iob had not (that we read) *the palsy, the stone, the collick, therefore* *sure are no such diseases.* If you will haue this an argument, let this be your proposition, and hereafter produce it *As the diseases or infirmities the body of man is* *sub. Et vi. 10 by Satan, those had Iob.*

Iob. 2. 6.

The killinge
of him recei-
ued. which
he was ex-
pectinge for
his due.
Mat. 4. 3. 8

You permitted the diuel to assault *Iob* in his bodie, which before he had denyed him: doth it therevpon follow that he might doe to the body of *Iob* what he would? To the diuel great power likewise was granted ouer the blessed bodie of our Saviour. He tooke & carried it (in the ayre) out of the wilderness vnto *Ierusalem*, and lett it on a pynacle of the temple, and from thence he had it to an exceeding high mountaine. Had Satan because of this leaue and permission, absolute and full power ouer *Christs* & *Iobs* bodie, & not a limyted power? Again, were this so, yet it may well be that though the diuel could, yet he would not enter into *Iob*. Because the marke the diuel aymed at, was to draw *Iob* from his feare of God, and eschewing of euill, to the committing of euill, and blaspheminge of God to his face; wherevnto possession serued not so much, as other kind of afflictions.

Iob. 2. 3.

Arg. 7.
P. 2. 76.

Physiologus goes on, and powres out other arguments of like liquor. *What possession* (saith he) *the diuell hath in any, the same hath he in all the posterity of Adam, yea in Adam himselfe.* This proposition it were in the *Masters* of *Bedlam* might resolue you in. Yet go on, what then? But there is no real possession in all the posterity of *Adam*. Though I wil not strue with you in this point, but willingly yeilde it, yet the reason you render of it is verie silly, to wit, *for that the image of God is yet essentially in man.* As if the Lord could not & doth not preserve that little rubbish of his image left in his creature though he suffer Satan to enter really into it. The Diuel entered in to paradise before mans transgression: yea the aer carries a stamp of Gods wisdom and power, yet the diuel hath an essentiall being in it. But to come to the argument it selfe. *Adam was not essentially possesse, and with him all his posterity: therefore there is no essential possession.* Such an argument for all the world is this. *All men haue not the gown, therefore none haue the gown.* I maruaile how *Physiologus* could make it without the help of *Orthodoxus*. Although this argument deserue rather to be hissed at, then answered, yet I returne that the consequence is faultie. It followeth not that none of *Adams* posterity be really possesse, if all be not: because *Adam* and euery one of his posterity are not by the appointment of god, to tast of euery in firmity, that they by their sinnes haue brought themselves in daun-

Answer,

ger

ger of, and made themselves subiect vnto. *Adam* and every sonne of his are subiect to the leprosie, palsy, stone, growt &c. yet is not every one a leper, every one hath not the pally, stone, &c.

But goe to *Physiologus*, open your packe to the bottome. Then take this with you: *If an humane bodie be capable onely of an humane soule: then is it incapable of an essentiall diuel: but the first is true: therefore also the latter.* Arg. 7. pag. 57.

If this proposition of yours *Physiologus* be undoubtedly true, as you doe tell vs: I intreat how you & *Orthodoxus* doe liue: & whether you two breath & draw aire, whether also you receiue any sustenance. For if you breath, or receiue sustenance into your bodies, then seeinge aer, meat, drinke, be not an humane soule, but other substances: either you two haue no humane soules, or your two bodies be capable of other substances besides your soules.

You proceeds, *Sathan* so possesseth, as *Christ* innadeth his house, that is, dispossesteth him of his house, for so appeareth your meaning to be. This you say indeede, but proue it not. Again *Physiologus* will make it good by a distribution of inbeing: of all the kindes whereof he setteth out which may be giuen to this real possessor. Arg. 9. Ans. Arg. 10. pag. 58.

I answer, The wicked spirit is in the bodie, as in a definitiue place: What now *Physiologus*? Are you struck dead with this answer, that you haue those one worde to say? Take hold then of another argument if you can goe no further in this: Thus then you reason. If the diuel be really in the bodie, he is there either hypostatically, making one person with the bodie; or else essentially; to giue an essentiall forme to the intended operations: But he is in the body neither of those wayes. I graunt it, and yet you neuer a whit the nearer: I cannot: but maruaile at your proposition, which though it be lame, is yet of admirable force: It is able to proue that the diuel is no where. For wher soeuer he is, he is there either hypostatically, or formally, but he is in no place either of both waies, and so no where. Nay your selues selues may be proued not to be in your houses, nor in any other place, because you make not one hypostasis with it, nor giue vnto it an essentiall forme: Make much of this proposition, as of a rare iewel. It is as good as *Cyges* his ring, by which you may goe inuisible: which faculty would serue you especially *M. Deacons* for many strange feat. Arg. 11. Si dicimus quod res vera, (say they) in the margin) atque adeo, autopropos ad effectum in esse: est hoc, vel hypostaticum, vel formaliter, quod est absurdum Ans.

In the twelfth place they argue thus. If diuels haue an essentiall being in men; when their said being there may be perceived by corporal sense: but the latter is false, therefore the first. Arg. 13. pag. 78: and 97.

D 2

By this

Answer 1.
Pla. 34:11

2

By this reason the Angels of the Lord pitch not their tents about them that feare him, neither doe they minister to the kings of saluatiō: for this cannot be perceaued by corporall sence. There be many things which we know and perceauē only by faith. Secondly, the assumption or second part of the argument I denie: & affirme, that we may know by corporall sence, when the diuel is really and substantially inherent within man, euen by the supernaturall effects & operations which Sathan in such case wth to send forth which any signes doe signifie and declare this inherēcie. Now these signes or effects are by corporall sence discerned: That which in the generall we know and perceauē by faith, that in the particular, touching this or that person, we know by sence.

Argu. 13.
pag 79.

Their last argument is this, *The diuels violent rending & tearing with other the vnnaturall actions, may effectually be wrought in the man possessed, though the diuel neuer essentially enter into his bodie: this entrance therefore to such purpose is needlesse, and so by consequence there is none.*

Answer.

The Antecedent or first part of this argument is false, as I haue shewed in my Navigation page 21: But supposing it were true, we must know that it is a iudgment, or an increase of this said iudgment, when besides the vexation of Sathan, our bodies shalbe a receptacle and place of aboad for the vnleane spirit to dwell in, which were made to be a temple for the holy ghost. And in this respect (were the antecedent true) there is sufficient to moue the Lord to permit Sathan to enter into the bodie, and Sathan to desire this entrance. And thus much for your first conclusion, no lesse absurdly handled by you, then propounded. Wherein I haue bene the larger, because it is the maine poynt controuerted: and as it were the foundation or corner stone, whereon our whole buildinge doth stande.

Your second assertion is, *That Diuels haue no true naturall bodies peculiar to themselves: which makes as much for his not beinge really in mens bodies, as it doth for his not being really in the Aer.* But I will not follow you at euery turne, least I shoulde too much distrust the Readers iudgment. Besides I am more then half wea-rie already with your sence-lesse disputes. Many famously learned in the Church both of ancient time, and this present, attribute a kinde of bodie to Spirits, not grosse and palpable, as theis inferiour bodies be, but of an incomprehensible subtilty: of which nomber are Tertullian, Augustine, Bernard, the Schoole-men, Zanchius with many

THE DIALOGVE

many others. These *Discomfets* take vpon them selfe to refell the arguments which make for bodies, & then propound some of their owne against them. In refelling Celestiall bodies they shew themselves turne-like, & every thing wheels so about with them, that they know not where they are. If *diuels* (say they) haue celestiall bodies and enter into men whose bodies are Elementarie, then we should haue a compound *superior* all motion, both in respect of the *diuels*, whose proper motion should be *Circular*, & of the *man*, whose motion is downe right. As if it were tedious to unfold all the fooleries of this argument, I will therefore passe ouer this, and the rest of their wise refutation, and come to their owne confirmation of it. How doe you prooue *Spirits* haue no bodies? First out of their wordes, *Spirits* and *diuels* haue no flesh or bones, as you see me haue. This place proues no more but that they haue not naturally palpable & solid bodies like mens, For otherwise you might conclude the Aer to be also voyd of body, because it hath no flesh & bones. Again say you: *The Lord hath made his Spirits his messengers, & his ministers a flame of fyre.* From hence you must conclude thus, They which be as fyre haue no bodies: which is true if fyre it selfe haue no body: you see then, how wisely you reason. Thirdly, which hath most force in it, and for which cause I take this paynes to repeat these reasons, *They which can be in the body of a man to the number of a Legion, that is six thousand, six hundred, sixty & six cannot possibly be any corporall substances:* But the *diuels* may be in the body of a man to the number of a Legion, that is 6666. & therefore they cannot possibly be any corporall substances. To let passe the proposition, though the moates in the sunne beames be bodely things, and yet it may be as many as a Legion in as narrow roome as a mans body: did you dreame you *Discomfets*, when you put downe this assumption? Or hath the truth wrunge from you a true confession whether you would or no? By this one argument, all the first part of this Dialogue, wherein you oppugne the reall inherency of *Spirits* in possesed bodies is overthrowne. It can not be but lyars should be taken tripping at one time or other. Now then if you please, we wil proceede to your fourth Dialogue.

pag 81:

pag 94
Luke 14:19.

Hebrew 1:7:

Marko 5: 11

+

A Summary of the Fourth Dialogue

In the fourth Dialogue you contend, That *Diuels* cannot assue bodies vnto them. Where first it is to be obserued that this disputation

pag 101:

THE 4. DIALOGVE.

23

body: but that he doth not forme or quicken as the soule doth our body: neither doth he make it to passe into one substance with himselfe, as did the word of god with an humane bodie: for diuells can put of those bodies, when they please. The diuel, as saith Augustine, fitteth vnto himselfe some body as it were a garment. A gaine, These bodies which the spiritus doe apply vnto themselves, be aery: for euen as water is congealed into yce, and sometime hardeneth til it become christall, euen so the aer wherewith spirits doe cloath themselves, is thickened, so that it becommeth a visible body. But if it may seeme that the aer alone is insufficient, they can also mingle some vapor or water withall, wherof colours may be made, for thus we see to be done in the raynbow. The spirits doe thicken & engrosse these bodies, by straight crussing those partes together for otherwise they might not be seene or touched. And yet we say not heere, that the diuell doth either create or make such things, but only that he is a minister seruing vnto nature. Euen so the husbandman, when he tilleth, and soweth his ground, & the gardiner when he pruneth and delueth a vyne, doe not create the corne of wine, but only doe helpe nature. So Augustine saith, that Lactat did not bring forth the colour vpon the floore, but did only rightly apply the formes & shaper. But it seemeth wonderfull how they can so speedely bring these things to passe. A skilfull artificey will worke any thing both handsomely & speedely. But giue the same instruments vnto an ignorant and unskilfull man, and he will doe it neither readily, nor yet very handsomely. Euen so any spirit, as a skilfull artificeer will bring more to passe in a mynute, then by the accustomed order of nature can be wrought in a long tyme. Thus far goeth Peter Martyr.

The generall consent of writers as it should seeme, did wring from you this modesty, that you would undertake no absolute denyall herof, but only make a question of it. As if it were a small matter to make Questions of things substantially true in themselves, and vniuersallye receaued. Would you haue Christians become Academicks: or hath not the world had enough of Peter Lumbards diuinity? It seemes you haue little regard of troublinge the Church. I wish they may haue more which haue the allowance of such bookes to the presse. yet seing such lauish Discourses must coe abroad, least any should be deceabed by your vaine glose, I wil proceede to examine your doing. The argument vpon which you ground, is after this manner. If the Diuel affinis to himselfe a body, it is either a true body, or a phantastickall body, one created some time before, or then newly, either the bodye of a liuing man, or of a dead man: But none of all these, & therefore no body. I answer first, that he affu-

ibidem
sect. 26

pag. 100.

pag. 100. 109
102, 103: &
104, 105.

meth both a true body, and a phantastickall body: sometimes the one, and sometimes the other. Secondly that he taketh a created body. If you demand by whome? I answer by himself. You reply, that creation is proper to God alone: and I reioyne, that creation is twofould. One when a thing is made of nothing, as all things were in the first begininge, in which power no creature may challenge any part: the other when bodies are framed of some matter al ready beir g: In this kinde the Lord doth vse the ministry of his Angels. If it seeme hard to giue the name of creation to this latter kinde: then I answer, that the body the diuel vsually assumeth, is an vncreated body: The matter of his body is from god & from his creation, it being made of aether thicken'd or of some such like matter. But the (¶) forme & in that it is a body, hauing the bigtiefle, proportion, colour, voyce & motion of a body, is meere from the diuel. Here by I say it is plaine, that it is an vncreated body * formed by the diuel, but not created by him. For then he should make it of nothing: Neither is it created by god, the alone creator: because it hath not the * forme, nor that it is a body from him. And yet notwithstanding it is a thing existing in nature, before the diuel assume it, as euery childe may perceauce. And that this spirits be able to performe we cannot but acknowledge, except we suppose them to be of weaker strength then other creatures. Doth not the sunne by his heate frame in the dung in the body of a mouse, and giue vnto it a life and sence? Philosophie and experyence doth teach thus much. It is absurd to imagine Angelicall natures to be of lesse ability then the sunne, especially in a matter of lesse difficulty by so much, as it is more easy to frame & assume a body orie tyd, then to quicken and endue it with sensible forme. And why should it not be as possible and eake for the diuel thus to compact and frame a body, for height, length, breadth, with all the partes & due proportions thereof of any kinde whatsoeuer, like to man, dog, cat, toade, &c. & enter into it, as to cause a tempest, & those other accidents whereof we reade in the history of Iob? Thirdly I answer that in apparitions, which are not properly called possessions, he neither taketh a living mans body, nor a dead mans, but only such a one as is made specially for that purpose, which when the errand is done, is dissolued into the same nature it was of before. And whereas you tell vs concerning the dead mans bodie, that if the diuell should assume the carcas of a man lately deceased, he should appeare in a white winding sheet: I see no reason of this winding sheet, except it

7 doe not
meanes that
the diuell
doth forme
or quicken
an airie bo-
die, as the
soule doth
our body:
but that fro
him it hath
the forme, fa-
shion, and
shape of a bo-
die.

a mouse formed

Job. 1.

THE 4. DIALOGVE.

cept it be for you *M. Deacon*, to doe your penance in. But you adde,
mens bodics were created for the Lord, & not for infernal spirits: True. page. 101.

To this end mans body was not created. But heerevnto hath man made his body subiect by his owne transgression. You say further. If the diuel can assume to him self a dead body, then we must needes imagine a resurrection of bodics before the generall iudgement, and that performed by the diuel, whereas that power is proper to god. This proposition is false. In the resurrection the soule and body shall be vnited together, and by this coniunction the body againe quickned. Now this can only Iehouah doe. And after this manner many dead bodics arose and came out of the graues, & appeared to many at the resurrection of Christ. But heere is no such coniunction: neither doth the spirit assuming, quicken the body assumed. The diuel is too weake to performe either of those. So that for any thing you say, he may take liuing or dead bodie, which he please. Thus we see there is no truth nor soundnes in this argument, but a meere trifling & abusing of the Reader, as wel concluding that neither good angels can possibly rake bodics vpon them (contrary to the expresse truth in the scripture) as that the wicked cannot. VVhich kinde of affirmations would rather be confuted by good sound correction, then by disputation of any man of learning, though as meane as my selfe: And this is all the wise prooffe you bring. The rest of the dialogue is spent in refelling the reasons for the contrary, which be cheifly fiue.

Math. 27. 53

The first, Good Angels haue appeared in assumed bodics, and therefore wicked Angels may doe likewise.

This argument you would shift of by diuers foolish vntruths, first, for that it consisteth not of things essentially alike in euery respect. VVhy Sirs? Haue you found out a difference in the essence of good and wicked Angels? All sound demines hitherto haue made their difference only in their quality. But you are nothing dainty of such nouelties. Wel to let this passe: How shew you there is a diuers reason of them in this poynt? In this sort: *The priuiledge of celestiall Angels, is not incident to the infernall.* To graunt you this, what doe you build from hence? But to assume a body is the priuiledge of celestiall angels. This is a second vntruth. You were ashamed it may be to expresse it plainly (I would be glad to heare you were growne so bashfull) but it must necessarily be vnderstood. If to assume bodics were the celestiall angels priuiledge, the Lord which is the maintainer of this priuiledges, would neuer haue suffered Sathan to haue

pag. 101.
Zanch. de o-
peribus redē
part. 1 lib. 4.
cap. 10.
Piscator in
Math. 4. 3.

entred:

A SURVEY OF

entred into the body of the serpent. You are to vnderstand therefore, that this *assuming* is not done or permitted by god for the benefit of the spirits, but for the comfort or discomfort of man. You add, *Neither yet are they equall with the celestiall Angels in knowledge and power.* It is ynough if the euill angels haue knowledg and power to compact and frame a body of the ayre and such like matter, & as a garment to put it on. And this knowledg and power they haue.

Fourthly, say you, *the bodies wherein good Angels appeared, were not created by themselves, but by god.* I answer, if they were such as were immediatly made of nothing, the Lord was the only workman of them: but if of some forebeeinge matter, their ministry might haue a place. But admit they were immediatly made, may not the Lord also create bodies for wicked spirits to vse in their speciall seruices? You imply *he will not.* It is presumption to search further into God his will, then his word and actions doe warrant vs: and 'tis blindness not to acknowledg so much, as they leade vs vnto. Seeing then the Lord in iust iudgment permitteth Sathan to be a lying spirit in the mouthes of all *Abassi* prophets, and to come in all deceiuenes by Antichrist to beguile the reprobate: is it any thing contrary to his holy iustice and will, to allow him such meanes, whereby he may accomplish the vengeance determined? Euen so in this case.

Fifthly you say, that *howsoeuer good Angels haue appeared, yet of euill Angels no example can be giuen.*

The examples be more then the haire of your head. But you dare auouch any thing against the testimony of the whole worlde, christian and heathen. To omit auncient examples (least perhappes you say they be past date, the like being ceased in our times, as you doe say of possession) the apparition neere *Augusta* about the yeare 1503. vnder *Maximilian* the first Emperour is famous, which carried the resemblance of *Margarete a Reth Abbatesse of Esclesnew.* &c could not only be scene and handled, but also speake most significantly. *George Sabin*, a man honored for his learning with the dignity of knight hood by *Charles the 5.* and sonne in law to *Phil. Melancthon*, writeth of three apparitions in his time, one of sixe spirits in the forme of monks, ferried ouer the *Rhene* by a fisherman of *Spire.* The second of a whole charriot full of monks: the third of a maid wooed by a spirit in the similitude of a man. And it is knowne what of late hath happened at *Berlin*, and other places of *Saxony.* At *Spanden in Germany* in the yeare 1594. Sep. 13. the diuell

The. Erasmus
de Lamiis,
pag. 17:

Sabin, Elg. 1.
Eleg. 7
Eleg. lib. 4
Eleg. 4

THE DIALOGVE.

27

diuel appeared in the shape of a man, to a yong youth *Gabriell Crü* offering him great riches if he would promise to be at his pleasure, & this not once, but the second time. To him also appeared *Gabriel* a spirit in shew of a good angel, foure seuerall times. In the same towne the diuel did walke visibly in the view of diuers. It were endlesse to insist vpon reherfall of the manifold examples of this kide. Yea something to this purpose may be sayd out of holy Scripture. *Chrysostome* writing vpon the patience of *Iob* saith, that he which brought tidings of the house, & destruction of his samety & cattle, was not a man, but a spirit. For if thou wert a man (saith he) how didst thou know that this winde came from the wilderness? or if thou wert there, how hapneth it that thou wast not destroyed with the rest? Some thinge also it maketh (as I thinke) for confirmation hereof, that foure leuerall messengers vse not only the same speech, but the verie same wordes: *I ouely am escaped to tell thee*. Also that they come so patt one after the other, before the former had ended his speech, & that one of them saith *The fire of god is fallen from heauen, and hath burnt vp &c.* *Piscator* saith, that when the diuel came to *Christ* in the wilderness to tempt him, he came in specie viri &c. in the shape of a man, as angels are wont to doe when they appeare vnto men. And this we shall the rather beleue, if we remember that the diuel is said to come vnto *Christ*, to haue speach with *Christ*: that he tempted him in communication. Hither also apperteineth, that witches are said to haue their familiar spirits. Except the diuels did put vpon them bodies, and in them were familiarly conuersant with these wicked weomen, how could there be any familiarity betwene a diuel & a woman? Did not also the angels thus as oft as they did familiarly conuerse with men? Besides who knoweth not this to be verried in daily experience? *Zanchius* having affirmed that (in his iudgment) diuels can assume bodies, and in them appeare, speake &c. vseth these words. Moreouer there be very many, & those verie graue writers, who affirme that this hath fallen out often. *Augustine* writeth so of this matter, that he saith it is impudencie to denie it. And a little after *Zanchius* saith of himselfe. Without the note of impudencie this cannot be denied. And who is there liuing that doubteth of the diuels appearing to some heere and there in visible formes and shapes at this day? Or that witches and diuels in bodies assumed, haue familiar speach & communication together? Doe we not daily heare of such occurrents? Doe not witches in all countries, make thus much knowne by their confessions, with many circumstances therevnto apperteyning,

Gallobelg. lib. 11:

*Iob. 1. v: 15
16. 17. 19:*

in March 4.

*1 Sam. 28: 7:
8:*

*de operibus
red. part. 1
lib. 4. cap. 16*

which all tend to the confirmation hereof. Verily the diuel his assuming of bodies and appearing in them vnto men, is so manifest by experience in all ages, past and present, that we may wel say with *Augustine* and *Zanchius*, It is impudencie to deny it. Thus impudent are none, but those who either deny that there are diuels, or witches. The lesser of which is horrible impiety. This then is another vntruth.

And heere (by the way) we may assure our selues that the *Discouersers* deny this latter, and are of opinion there are no witches, nor any bewitched. For if diuels cannot assume bodies, without which they cannot appeare, nor haue any familiarity with men: if secondly *Sathan* haue no power to torment, vex or any way to afflict the body of man as these men also tell vs, in affirming that there is no actuall possession in these daies of the gospel: how are there any who haue familiar spirits, whome the scripture calleth witches? Or that be afflicted in their bodies by the ministry of *Sathan* & mallice of a witch, which is that we call bewitching? This is something confirmed by their oft quoting of *M. Skut* his *Discouery of witchcraft*, and their commending of that his exposition of *1. Sam. 28. 8.* &c. Hereby it is manifest that together with *M. Skut* they hold that there are no witches, nor any at this day bewitched. They doe not indeede deliuer this in plaine tearmes, least happely they should thereby irritate the reuerend Iudges of the land, by making them guilty of shedding much innocent blood: but you see that from some of their publike assertions it is to be gathered by necessary collection: and how they approue of that booke which denyeth witches & witchcraft, yea doe commend it: saying: that *if without preiudice, and with a single respect to the truth, we would but deliberately peruse that priuiledged discourse, &c.* then should we without doubt see a diabolicall discourse published with priuiledge.

Lastly you say that the afore said argument is a deceivable *Elench*, from may be, to being indeede. I pray you *Discouersers* is not the question of may be? Is not your position in the beginning of this dialogue, whether spirits & diuels can assume &c. We vie then no *Elench* in the matter, but you a meere dotage, which like the butcher haue forgotten the knife in your mouth. Besides, this & such like arguments be rather *ab esse, ad posse*, then *a posse ad esse*: as a childe that hath learned but *Sum & Possum*, may (helped a little) be able to tell you.

The second reason for assuming of bodies, are the words of the psalme: He cast vpon them the scircnesse of his anger, indignation, and wrath

THE 4. DIALOGVE.

29

wrath, by sending angels of euil. Heere you afford a double answer. First, that *Angels of euil*, be angels that were denouncers of euil, that is, *Moses & Aaron*, as *Tremelius* interprets it, with whom you accord. Secondly that whatsoeuer these Angels be, yet they are saide onlie to be sent among them, not into them, and therefore no prooffe can be had from hence for assuming of bodies.

I reuerence the authority of *Tremelius*, and dare not take vpon me to censure his doing: yet against it I might alleadg the consent of many interpreters. But instead of them all the booke of *wisdom* shall alone setue, which alluding, to this place expoundeth those *Angels of euil*, to be horrible & fearfull sights. *They were scattered,* chap. 17:3. *(saith he) fearing horribly, & were troubled with apparitions. Again,* 4:14 *terrible visions and sorrowfull sights did appeare vnto them. Again,* *Sometimes they were troubled with monstrous apparitions.* Hereby it is apparant that these *angels of euil* were construed by the learned Iewes in auncient time, not to be *Moses and Aaron*, but wicked spirits. Seconly, that though they were not sent into the Egyptians, (for then they should haue possessed them, which neuer any affirmed) yet they were sent amongst them in terrible formes, which coule not be but by assuming some sensible bodies, which is sufficient against you: and as much as is inforced from this scripture. And now ler the Reader chuse, whether he will rather follow the booke of *wisdom*, or your booke of folly. pag. 108,

The third argument is: *The diuell assumed the body of the Serpent when he tempted Eua.*

You oppose heerevnto a threefold reply: First, *If the diuell entered essentially into the Serpent, then eue he became an essentiall Serpent, or the serpent an essentiall diuell.* Surely you are bereft of comon vnderstanding which so confidently blatter out such palpable ignorance. Doth not god essentially dwell in all things? But is the creature thereby made god, or God the creature? Secondly, you say that *the serpent in this place is not a naturall serpent, but metaphorically the diuell.* It were tedious to refute particularly your childish proofes. If all the circumstances in *Genesis 3:* could not induce you to acknowledge a naturall serpent, as the instrument of *Sathan* in this temptation, yet the Analogie of the second Adam (which wrought our saluation by vntwisting that threed, which the diuell had spun to our destruction) ought to haue preuayled something with you. Our Saviour being baptised the spirit of god descended vpon him like a doue: and a voyce from heauen proclaymed him withall to be the beloued sonne of god. By which it is playne that as in ouer- pag. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. Mat. 3. 16. 17

throwing the first Adam there was a wicked spirit, so in establishing the second Adam there was the holy spirit: as to deceaue the first there was vsed a serpent, so to confirme the second Adam there was vsed a doue: as the first by the diuels fraud in the serpent, was quite stripped of all sauing graces, and disherited from beinge the sonne of god, so the second by the spirit of truth in the doue, was as it were visibly replenished with the fulnesse of all grace, and not only himself then solemnly annoynted to be the sonne of god, but also by whome all the Elect should be made partakers of the same dignity. From whence then I reason by Analogie thus. That if at the second Adam his installing into his office there was visibly and substantially apparant a Doue, wherein was repletiuely the holy ghost: then at the deceauing of the first Adam, there was visibly & substantially a serpent, wherein was definitiuely the wicked spirit. The nature of Opposites require that where one is reall, the other should be also reall. And the serpent & the doue be vsually in the scriptures set one against the other. And thus much for your second reply which you shut vp with a *Probatum est*, because *Reignald Skot* houlding the same opinion, his booke and the opinion it self, is very authentically priuiledged in our English Church by publique authority. As for *M. Skot* there is none of any sound vnderstanding, but he allows his iudgmēt better in a *Hoperground*, then in a case of diuinitie. And as for his & your *Priuilege* whereon you brag your selfe so much, take heede least you strayingn your *M.* his countenance too farr, to beare out your absurdities, he plvck not his cloath o-uer your eares. Your third reply yealds, that *Sathan was there togither with the serpent, but not in the serpent*, and you would faine prouoe, *The diuel could apply the serpents tongue to his purpose, though he entred not in essentially into him, no lesse then a Minstrell can make his pipes sound what he please, albein he enter not essentially into the baggs.* And in this merry conceyt you sling about your armes like winde mill sayles in a morryce dance, thinking your selues some iolly fellows. But if the pride of your iollity be past, let me demandaund of you this question, what is the true efficient of the sounde of the pipe? The minstrell, or the motion of the aer by his breath? You must needs answer it is the motion of the aer: for the pipe will sound as well by a paire of bellowes tyed at his arme, as by the breath of his mouth: as is apparant in Organes and other winde instruments. Besides it is a rule in nature, That the mouer and the thing moved, must needs touch one an other without entercourse of any thing

Page 115.

Page 116.

Arist. Phys.
lib. 8. cap. 2.

thing comming betwene. Now then if the piper be not the true efficient, it is no marueile if no necessity force him to creepe into the bag: but if the breath and the mouing of the aer be the true worker indeed, that must both enter into the bagg, & into the pipe too, or else nothing at all will be donne. But you will reply, that the spirit may be likewise not the principall efficient, but remayning with out as the Minstrell doth, might send something into the serpent to cause such a workinge. I answer, the spirit is the principall efficient. For in supernaturall workes it must needes be the principall mouer should be supernaturall in regard of that worke. And therefore seeing the wicked spirit is cheit agent, it is necessary he should be ioyned immediatly to that which is moued by him, without interposition of any other thinge. If then you can count your game, you shall see you haue got nothing by this reckoning, but only a vaine hope to make your selues merry withall for a time.

The fourth argument for *assuming bodies* is drawne from the *Angels speaking in Baalams asse*, which you labour to infringe two waies: first for that it *was not an angell, but Iehouah himself which caused that speaking*: secondly if it *were an angel, yet he speaks no otherwise then the former similitude of a Minstrel did declare*. For the first, I answer you argue deceitfully in opposinge Iehouah and an angell in this action, as if they could not be ioynt workers, Iehoua principally, the angell ministerially: especially seeing it is the manner of the scripture to attribute that to the Lord without mention of any other, which notwithstanding he administreth by meanes. *Iehoua (saith Moses) talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fier*. And againe after he hath repeated the ten commandments, he saith: *These words Iehoua spake vnto all your multitude in the mount &c*. In which he teacheth that Iehoua was a Law-giuer, & nameth no other whose office was vsed therein: Yet Stephen saith, *They receaued the law by the ministry of angels*. And S. Paule: *It was ordayned by angels in the band of a mediator*. You see then how trifeling this argument is. But you will say: In the giuing of the lawe, the scripture doth warrant a ministry of angels, but in the matter of Balaam no such thing is any where taught. I answer, It is a good rule obserued by some for interpreting the scriptures *Aequalis est doctrina, quae penit a phrasi equali*. Equall manner of speech doth afford: equall doctrine. Besides shall we thinke the greatest workes of all other, as the giuing of the law, and the comfortinge of Christ himselfe were performed by angels, & that the Lord reserueth the

Numb. 22:28:

pag: 117: 118

Deu 5.4.22:

Act. 7.53:

Galat. 3. 19.

Like 22, 43:

basest and meanest actions to be done immediatly by himselfe. Greate cause therefore had those famous learned men *Lyra, Martyr, Zanchins, &c.* to acknowledg an angell in this busynesse, whose iudgments if you had wayed and followed, it had bene more commendation for you, then thus to roue at randome with your bolts. Further you vrge, It could not be an angel that opened the asses mouth, *because the Angel stood before Balaam with a drawne sword in his hand to haue slaine him, and Angels can not be in sondry places at the same instant.* I answer, Seeing the Lord did open the mouth of the asse, and *Balaams* eyes by angels as hath bene proued, that not one angell alone, but diuers were vsed in this businesse. He which hath so many thousand of thousands waiting vpon his throne for all deseignes, should he for defect of seruitors be faine to worke in his owne person? Whereas you say secondly, *Admitting it was an Angell, yet he spake no otherwise then the similitude of a distrest declarer.* I answer, If he spake in such sort, he must needes then really be in the asse, considering the true efficient of the pipes sound, is the mouinge of the aer (which is essentially in the pipe) and not the Minstrel. Besids in all things which are moued, the Mouer is immediatly applyed and ioyned vnto the thing moued. And why should Angels necessarily be sent in person to those seuerall places where businesse lye, if they were able to accomplish them being absent? I passe ouer your ridiculous conceit, *of the Angells essentiall conuersion into the asse, and how he was ridden, and galloped, & spured, & stricken &c.* which things no doubt, & more the asse had suffred, if either of you had bene in *Balaams* stead: For set a foole on horse-back, and he will gallop.

page 119.

page, 120,
a Sam, 28:

The fift argument for *assuming of bodier*, is from the apparition in the likenesse of *Samuell*: which example, if you bounde your question with strict tearmes of a true naturall body, we vse not in prooffe of this matter. For the sounder iudgment is, That apparition was a meere phantastie and illusion of Sathan. But if you intend (as indeede you doe) that euil spirits take vpon them neither true nor phantasticall bodies, that is, which be truly materiall & visible, though not compacted of flesh and bone, in which sence only we oppose it to a true body in this place, then this example is offorce to presse you. You incline to *Reig. Skott* his opinion who would haue it but a meere cosening trick of the witch at *Endor*, without any apparition at all either to the king, or to the witch. But this fancy wanteth sufficient foundation to stand on. *M. Skott* woulde proue that

page 125.

Saul

Saul saw nothing, because he asked the witch what she saw, and what was his forme? It is true that Saul saw nothing at first, for things were donne by degrees, as the text plainly shewes. Before the resemblance of Samuell came vp, the witch saw other spirits like Gods ascending, then when they were vanished she beheld the forme of Samuell, yet not fully ascended: at which time she cryed out and answered Saul his demaund. After the Image was now perfectly come vp, Saul also himself saw him, as may be gathered by his bowing himself and falling downe: for otherwise Saul was of that temper both in regard of his regall dignity, and his own naturall courage, that it was not his manner to stoope to nothing. If one then shall reason thus, Saul saw nothing when he asked the question, therefore neither afterwards when he bowed himselfe, there is no validity in such a consequence. Therefore M. Skott failes much in his prooffe: he hath not sufficiently shewed that nothing appeared unto Saul. And admitting he had cleared that, yet this was but one part of his taske. He should also haue made it plaine that neither the witch saw any thing, beefore he had growne to this generall conclusion of no apparition at all. The diuel at this day visibly appeareth to many of our wise-men and wise-women, when they which cōe to aske counsaile of them, neither see nor heare any thing, but haue their answer at the second hand from their mouth. Were it so then that Saul neither saw nor heard any thinge, but what he receaued from the witch, this notwithstandinge, there might well be an apparition: and without controuersy there was so. Otherwise how coulde the witch haue knowne Saul? and foretould those things which afterwards fell out accordingly? To the former of these you answer (and what ye will say to the latter we shall know heereafter) that she of herselfe might and did know him very well, howsoeuer she dissembled the same for the present. This is incredible.. That a filly woman dwellinge far from the court, should so well knowe the King, that though he changed himselfe, put on other rayment, Or went by night, accompanied only with two men, and thus did what he could to be vnknowne, (because being knowne he could not bringe his purpose to passe) yet she should know him. Especially if withal we remember, that she was a witch, or at least reputed so to be, & that Saul had destroyed the witches, and forcerers out of the land: and therefore she could haue small harte to looke the king so often in the face, whereby to attaine to this perfect knowledge of him. And where you say that the conference performed to Saul, was cunningly

1 Sam: 28: 13

14.

Page 115.

Page 116.

delivered by the witch alone in her cell, she being a cunning Ventriloquist, as all Pythonists are: who can very hydeouslie speake in the bottom of their bellies, with an hollow counterfeyt voice, and therein by practise she was verie expert. I answer: you may tell vs also that the moone is made of a greene cheefe, but we may chuse whether we will beleue you. Yea, I for my part will as soone beeleeue this, as that For how could this silly woman (with all her cunning and craft) foretell, first the ouerthrow of the Israelites. 2. that it shoude be on the morrow. 3. that in that ouerthrow Saul and his sonnes should be flame. Nei theris it credible that she was able to make knowne to Saul the true cause of this feirce wrath of the Lorde, ready to be executed vpon him, and that his kingdome being rent from him, should be giuen to Dauid: all which be mentioned in this conference. Moreover, if the witch did vse a meere cosinage, and that she herselfe did see nothing, it should seeme this art, of sorcery, consisteth only in the opinion of men, and that in very deepe witches can doe, no more by Spirits, neither haue any greater familiarity with the, then all others haue. But then wherefore doth the scripture condemne them for *confessing with spirits*? and mention their *hauiing of familiar spirits*? For these reasons I thinke it stands better with reason to ioyne with the vniuersall consent of all the learned, then to follow M. Skott: his singuler opinion, though the discourse be *priuiledged*. Hitherto for your refutation.

Deut. 18, 11,
1 Sam. 28, 7-8.

pag. 127,
128.
Mag. sent. lib
2, dist. 10. c. 8.

The shutting vp of this Dialogue alleadgeth some authorities for Not assuming bodies, none of all which make to the purpose. Peter Lombard propoundeth a double question, first *whether diuells do substantially enter into the bodies of men*: the second *whether they essentially slip into their mindes*. To the first he answers doubtfully, but doth not deny it as these *Discouersers* doe. To the second negatively. Then you produce the testimony of Cennadius, Beda, & Augustine: which likewise deny an essentiall entrance into the minde. But what is this to *essentiall enying into the body*? These are two things distinct, and if you had not purposed fraud, you would not haue alleadged authorities *denying an essentiall entrance into the mindes*, to disprooue *essentiall entrance into the body*. Touching the rest of your testimonies, I am ashamed to spend time in rehearsing them. I graunt with Chrysostome, the diuill cannot compell to sinne, but suggest: with Irenaeus, that he is not formally in any, as the forme of that body wherein he is: with Muscalus, That he hath no absolute authority, but a subiected seruitude: with Gregory, that the power of Satan is

uener

THE 5. DIALOGVE.

35

never winst, though his will be alwaies wicked: with Trismegistus, that a humane soule cannot receaue any other to make one person with it (excepted only the sonne of god) then an humane body. I graunt you a l which these testimonies auouch but what gaine you thereby for strengthening your causes It is great folly to trouble your Reader with such impertinent wordes in the last place comes Reig: Skot to make all iure. Inceede his testimony is pregnant for you, but in the wordes you cite out of him be conteyned two infamous sentences, I hat the Diuels cannot by any meanes make them selues seene: that to assume a body for appearance, or other service, is all one as if the spirit leaving the essence of a spirit, should become corporall. For so is the meaning of his wordes. And what is his reason? why (forsooth) the diuel by his nature is a spirit, and therefore inuisible & insensible, and so this is contrarie to his nature. By this reason there was neuer apparition of holy angels: for they be likewise spirits, inuisible, insensible &c. Surely they which made trees in times past to call parliaments, spake with as great probability, as M. Skot hath affirmed this, as is apparant by that already let downe.

page. 139.

A Survey of the Fift Dialogue.

The fift Dialogue treateth of *Transformation*, the second speciall of *Corporall possisso*. As if either by assumptio of bodies, or change of forme, all corporall possellion were wrought, as the nature of generals doth require to be fully comprehended in the whole sume of their specials: And as if all transformation were bodely possellio, which is as vntrue, as the former distribution vnkilfull. The conclusion propounded is, *That Spirits & diuels cannot essentially transform them selues into any true naturall bodie.* In which sentence these Discourfers vnderstand *Transformation* to be a perfect change of one essence into an other, as if a spirit vterly chaunging his nature, & ceasing to be a spirit should be made in verie essence a man, or some such other thing: or else that he not transforming himselfe but transforming an other, should change the essence of a man into the essence of a woife, or some like nature. In which is to be noted a double absurdity. First that they dispute as a doubt, which neuer entred into any man, for any thing I can finde, to make any question of. to wit, *wheth r spirits might perfectly leaue their owne nature, & throughly change themselves into an other being.* Inceed this were a happy Trans-

formation for them, if they could cease to be diuels, and so escape their condemnation. But neither wise man nor foole I thinke, euer dreamed of such a thing. Secondly, that *they confound all apparitions and appearances with their transformation*: as if the diuel could not cast sensible shewes of things before vs, yea and true bodies themselves, without either transforming himselfe, or some other thing into them. And thus by this occasion they runne it to their former question againe, sometimes making their *Transformation* to be nothinge else but an assuminge of bodies, eyther in truth, or in shew. Concerning which sufficient hath bene said in survey of the former dialogue: And what the spirits power is in this behalf, is apparant by the Egyptian forcerers rods, turned (at least in shewe) into serpents: by the frogges, and the waters turned into blood: by the apparition of *Samuels* bodie, by those fearefull sights which troubled the Egyptians, yea by the disciples of our Sauour Christ themselves, which fearing they had seene a spirit, when they beheld our Sauour walking on the waters, declare what the iudgment of the Church was then concerning apparition of spirits in sensible forms: neither doth our Sauour reprove that opinion, but only shewes there was no cause of feare, he beinge no such as they imagined.

Therefore I neede not trouble the Reader with discussing, *How the diuell is transformed into an angel of light*, or *how Nebuchadnezzar became an oxe*, or in ripping vp any of that discourse following, onlie let vs consider that which is alleadged from our Sauour Christes speech, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me haue*. VVhich wordes seeme to make against this *assuming of bodies by spirits*. For if they doe take vpon them sensible humane bodies, how is the argument of our Sauour firme? The disciples might haue replied, that howsoever spirits haue not flesh and bones naturally, yet they assume humane bodies for a time, visible and palpable, & therefore the iudgment of sence could not be sufficient warrant to put away their feare. For answer heerevnto, *Thomas Aquinas* & other of the Schoole men think, our Sauours argument to be of small strength, except some other addition be made vnto it. But herein the *scholemen* were deceaued, as also many others, in that they frame the argument from part only of our Sauours words, and not from the whole. Our Sauour doth not (meerely) reason thus, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones, But I haue flesh & bones, and therefore am no spirit*, as I see the argument is vulgarly taken, but more fully in this sort, *A spirit hath not flesh & bones, as you see me haue*. which wordes afford

Wisd 17
Math. 14.36

pag 156:157
Luk. 24.38.

humane that
is like, to
maus

afford this syllogisme. *A Spirit hath not in a true humane body pearced hands & pearced feete, as mine were lately on the crosse: But I heere present haue in a true humane body pearced hands and pearced feete, as they were a few dayes since vpon the crosse (whereof be your selues witnes in seing and feeling me) and therefore I heere present am no spirit, but verily your Lord and Master, who was lately crucified.*

And this is strengthened by the words precedent to the aforesaide Scripture, and subseqent. *Behould (saith Christ) my hands and my feete, for it is I my selfe: handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh & bones, as ye see me haue. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feete.* As if the Lord had said, You suppose this bodie that stands thus on the suddaine before you, is not mine, but the phantasticall body of a spirit. But you are deceaued, for it is I my selfe. And that you may be out of doubt, looke vpon me, and handle me. A spirit hath not a true naturall body, consistinge of flesh, blood, and bone &c. but only the similitude of these things, and therefore this my true humane body you may easily discerne from such, if care and circumspection be vsed by you: View me therefore well, and handle me. The softnesse of my flesh, the hardnesse of my bones, that vitall and sweete warmnesse that is perceaued in a liuing body, and is proper vnto it, which you may feele, doe witnesse that it is my body you doe behould, and not a spirit. But certaine may you be hereof, if you looke vpon my hands and feete, which you know (according to the scripture) were lately peirced. Heere I shew you them. Doe you not see the marks there of? and the hoales which the nayles haue made in them? we may add heerevnto the exceeding great ioy which did heerevpon arise in the disciples. For it followeth, *And while they beleued not for ioy, that the Lord was risen, & wounded thereat &c.* This excessive ioy nothing caused so much, as the behoulding and handling of the visible and palpable marks of his peircing. Had not Christ shewed & they beheld and handled these bloudie marks, and certaine marks of Christs owne bodie, they had not vndoubtedly so abounded in ioy, but rather continewed still troubled, and in their former doubt, at least in part, and some of them, if not all. Hereby it is plaine, that this scripture maketh for apparitions, and not against them.

If the reason drawne from this scripture were of any validity against apparitions, then could not the holy angels assume bodies, neither had there euer bene apparition of them, which we knowe is ouerthrown by many places of scripture.

For the rest of the Dialogue we are behoulding to *Lycanthropus*, which hath kept to good *Dicorion* in all the former Discourses, that he neuer howled forth like a wolve till now. Your facility is ineffectual in speedy curing his disease. If you proceede with like successe in this kinde, you will quickly surpasse the *Exercit* at *Disaguit* *ion*. *Lycanthropus* was but a toole, that he complained not himselfe at your first meeting. It seemeth he might haue had present help. But take heede Mr. *Harsnet* be not sent from his Lord with Commission to examine the matter of some Legerdemaine. And thus hauing run the race of this Dialogue, you make a passage to the next comming now to *Actuall Possession*, which is the opposite member to *Reall*. Whereby it will that neither the diuel hath any reall power without. For whatloeuer he doth exercis: outwardly, it is actually enely faith your goodly diuision, and so by your account he shall be really no where.

A Survey of the Sixt Dialogue.

page 166.

The sixt Dialogue handleth *Actuall possession*, which they describe to be an extraordinary affliction, vexation, or torment, that *Sathan* doth effectually inflict vpon men for a time. And this *actuall affliction* and *torment* very vnicuallly they oppose to that is generally called *possession*. Whereas wholoeuer is possessed according to that we define possession, the same is *actually*, & *effectually* (as they speak) *afflicted*, *vexed*, or *tormented by Sathan*. Where therefore either the spirit of god in the sacred Scriptures speaking of *Demoniacks* mentioneth only their *vexation* by the spirit, or any learned writer, that maketh not at all against vs, or for you, as you very sillily pretend. The question and controuersy is, (whereof we haue spoken already) whether the diuel thus *vexing* a *Demoniack*, be within him. (definitiuely) as we affirme: or without him, as you aouche: and not whether *Demoniacks* be *effectually vexed by Sathan*. which *vexation* you opposing to that we call *possession*, and by it going about to disproue *reall possession*, doe therein like vnto him, that should deny a man to haue a soule, because he hath a body: and that by prouing he hath a body, will proue that he hath no soule. There be 2. parts of possession. 1. The diuel his inherencie in the body of man. 2. the diuel his vexing of that bodie.

see pag 38
37, & 163.

pag. 168.

This possession of diuels you acknowledging to haue bene in the daies of Christ: doe flatly deny any further continuance thereof now, in this time

time of the gospell.

The contrary herevnto, to wit, the perpetuity of possession, I haue heretofore proued by Scripture, & by reason, & nãely thus.

All the diseases that sinne made the body of man subiect vnto, doe or may remaine so long as sinne remaineth in man:

But possession is a disease that sinne made the body of man subiect vnto.

Therefore possession doth or may remaine so long as sinne remaineth in man. And so at this day vnto, vntill the end of the world.

This argument hath as yet receiued no answer from you, nor I trust neuer ittall. Instead thereof you haue fathered as absurd an argument vpon me, as euer I read: sending the Reader to the 31. page of the *Dockrine*, to seeke him it is mine: and therevnto forsooth haue you returned an answer. A very easie matter: euen as it is for one in straits to helpe himselfe with a lye. If at once (Gentle Reader) thou wouldst see cleerely as in a glasse, how corruptly these men deale with my poore writings, & shamefully abuse both thee, and me, but most of all themselves: then compare pages 174. 175. of their *Diallogicall Discourses*, with the 31. of the *Dockrine*.

But for the further pursuite and enlarging of the aforesaid argument, we are to vnderstand that all punishment due to the breach of gods law, is so long perpetuall, as the breach of gods law doth continue. & is (as euery one which abideth not in all things which are written in the booke of the law, to doe them). This sentence is perpetuall vntill the ende of the world. And albeit they which haue put on Christ, and be dead and risen againe with him, are freed from this curse, yet all that be called, be not chosen: nor euery one that saith Lord, Lord, shall haue him to beare their burthen, but shall feele the waight of their owne transgressions. Besides the faithfull are not exempted from the temporall chastisement. Neither are the written plagues only the stripes of sinne, but all other evils whatsoever not mentioned, are scourges prepared of the Lord for sinners. If thou wilt not keepe and doe all the words of this Law, the Lord will bring vpon thee euery sickness, and euery plague which is not written in the booke of this law: And that possession is a curse or plague of god, it needeth no prooue. Yea a greuous one it is, that he which was framed the temple of the holy spirit, should become a most horrible Caue and Denne of Sathan. From hence it must needes follow, that possession must haue a perpetuall beinge in the world, so long as men shall continue disobedient to god his

In the doctrine.

pag. 17. 18.

Dockrine

pag. 174.

1

pag. 174.

Galat. 3:10

Deut. 28. 37.

61

3 Cor. 4. 4
Eph. 2. 12
Eph. 2. 12

most holy commaundments. Moreouer, howsoeuer Sathans kingdome is abolished for the behalf of the elect, yet in respect of the wicked he is a god of this world, a prince of the air, & a principallity, a power, a worldly gouernour of the darknesse of this world. Doth the scriptures giue him these titles as if he was a god without a people, a king without a kingdome: a principallity without all sway and authority in his subiects. Therefore except you can shew vs, that none of the wicked now daies be of sathans kingdome, or that he doth rule his kingdome without tyranny, or that his tyranny hath not wayting vpon it possession, or that possession is now no punishment or chastisement for sinne: you shall deserue that as youre booke goes now abroad vnder priuiledg, so hereafter your selues should haue a priuiledg for ever setting forth any more booke.

As the perpetuity of, *officiis* is and hath bene proved by the holy scriptures, and by reason, so accordingly there haue bene *Demoniacs* from Christs time in the successiue ages vntil this day. That such there were for the space of 13. hundred yeares from Christ, appeareth by the ecclesiasticall histories called the *Centuraries*, as witnesseth *Cent. 2. pag. 110. Cent. 3. pag. 136. Cent. 4. pag. 439 440 Cent. 5. pag. 684 685. Cent. 6. pag. 341. Cent. 7. 158 159. Cent. 8. 341. et 375. Cent. 9. 265. Cent. 10. 320. et 337. Cent. 11 286 et 310. Cent. 12. 909. 910. et 932. Cent. 13. 631.* This perpetuity is further confirmed by the testimonie and iudgment of these writers following: who for the most part make mention of *Demoniacs* in their times. *Iustine Martyr* saith, that the christians ouer all the world healed very many that were possessed with euil spirits: which other inchaunters, conuincers, & sacrificers could not performe: & as yet (saith he) those men of ours procede in their purpose. See also *Iustine Martyr* in *Tryphone* We are accustomed (saith *Tertullian*) to assaile diuels & to drive them away from men. And againe: We drive out ill spirits without reward or hire. See *Tertullian* in lib. de *Corona militis*. For breuity (especially in so plaine a case) I will omit the other testimonies, & only name the seuerall writers with the booke and page. *Cyrian ad Demetrianum tract. 1. et Sermone de lapsis: et de Idolorum vanitate: et lib. 4. epistolarum, epistola 7. ad Magnū. Sox. m. lib. 4. cap. 16. Idem lib. 6. cap. 28. Caron. 90 Theodores lib. 4. cap. 21. Chrysostome in Tim. 5. de incomprehensibili dei natura hom. 4. Augustine lib. 8. de ciuitate dei. cap. 26. Fustebus Casariensis lib. 6. cap. 43. Bullinger in Math. 8. 28. Pet. Martyr loc. com. Sess. 4. Cap. 9. Sess. 16: Chyrenus in Math. 8. 28. Hunnius in Math. 17. 15. Philip Melancthon lib. Epistolarum.*

Apol. 1. pag. 246.

In Apolog.

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

41

Epistolæ. Chemicus de Sacramento Ordinis. Bezæ hom. 26. in historiam passionis, edit. 2. pag. 656. Vagellus in Theodoro Theologico. pag. 980. Darius in Marcu quist 38. Chassanum loc. com. lib. 1. cap. 17. Piscator in Math. 8. 28. But what neede these testimonies specially of the auncient writers, sith the Discowfers themselves acknowledge a generall consent among the learned writers, as touching the continuance of possession for about eight hundred yeares after Christ and that in these wordes. Honsæder Iustine, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, the consaile of Brachia, &c ecclesiasti. all histories doe all ioyntly auouch the continuance of possession in those times and places wherein they conuersed: yet no one of them all doe challenge extraordinary power to dispossesse Satan. But all these (say our Discowfers) were deceived, either by the cunning of the counterfeiter, or by mistaking some discourse, not much unlike possession, for possession is selfe. Thus sell these good Fathers into a strange imagination of some actuall possession: there being indeede no such thing at all. Is it not strange that these two petty fellows, that are euer foote stumbling, and haue as many lyes almost in their mouthes as they haue propositions, should so boldly controule these famous Doctors, and writers of Ecclesiasticall storie, and condemne them as men simple, deceived, and not able to discern of this matter. It seemes your Priuledge hath so inspired you, that the certaine knowledge of these things is to be drawne only out of your breasts. Let vs heare therefore the profound reasons which these great Clarke haue against possession in these daies of the gospel.

The first argument against the perpetuall possession of possession: pag. 168. infra.

The first is this. God hath not auouched the perpetuity of possession in any part of his word, therefore it was temporary, and no way perpetual.

Your proposition is false, For though it be not set down in expresse wordes: yet thence it is to be proued by necessary colligation, as is euident by the premisses. Secondly, were it true: It maketh sufficiently for the perpetuity of possession, that by holy scripture it can be proued, that sometimes there was possession, and that were possessed: except some scripture may be shewed for the abolishing of it, Otherwise I say, it remaineth still, so as it either is, or may be at this day.

pag 170. A. 5. 21

In the second place you reason thus. If no extraordinary power or means for expelling of diuels remaineth perpetuall, then neither possession is selfe remaineth perpetuall: But the first (say you) is true, therefore the second.

The

Anst.

Math. 17. 21

Mark. 9. 29

The proposition is false. Because there was not only an extraordinary means for the expelling of devils, which being temporary, ceased with miracles, but besides an ordinary means particularly & by name appointed for the dispossessing of devils, which remaineth until this day, and is perpetuall. We had a no such particular ordinance, yet notwithstanding we might at this day have remedy against this extraordinary evil. Call upon me, saith God in the day of trouble; & I will deliver thee. Or say, as you shall, askeny father (saith our saviour) in my name, that he will give you. Pray continually, saith S. Paul, what only in ordinary necessities or else in extraordinary too, but yet without comfort of obtaining: hath the Lord bound himselfe from all extraordinary visitation till the ende of the world: Or if any vntoient thing shall happen, is he such destitute of all remedy? Again, we have no extraordinary power remaining wherewith to cure palsy's, leprosy, and other diseases sometimes so cured, and yet notwithstanding the said diseases at this day remaine. And why may not as well this disease be now, notwithstanding we have no extraordinary power, wherewith to heale it: who would vouchsafe to spend time with such disputers? Then to come to your second proposition, let vs heare your proofe. Because say you extraordinary power of casting out devils was peculiarly appointed to Christ & his onely Disciples, which is a low degree of truth, vnderstanding Disciples as you doe, onely for the Apostles. Doth not our Lord say, I will send forth apostles that shall be in my name, they shall cast out devils, &c. Of whome he speaketh he this? Of his owne Disciples? Or of the heauenlie? It is most manifest he speaketh of those which should beleeue by their preaching. We stand not upon an extraordinary power for expelling of devils, & therefore I might well haue let this proposition passe, but that I would let you see your not extraordinary, but ordinary blindness. But to let this passe, your third argument concludeth thus: Plants in themselves perpetually existing, haue in themselves an ordinary & continuall working. But possession of devils (in these dayes of this world) is in it selfe neither ordinary, nor continually working, & therefore in these dayes there is no possession existing. I answer that perpetually existing is twofold: Naturall, and Possessive. Things naturall which haue an inoperable operation accompanying them, so long as they haue an existing: most needes also haue a continuall working, as the fyre must needs heate, the water molyten, &c. In this sense I doe not say that possession is perpetually.

Mark 16. 17.

p. 176

A. B. 3.

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

43

tuallly existing, for then euermore some should be posselt, which is far from my thought: but that men now and hereafter euen to the worlds ende ma, be possessed, when and as oft as the Lord shall please in such manner (that is with this kinde of correction) to cha- tice men: as appeareth by that here followeth. Things Politue be such as not by nature but by ordinance haue their power and effica- cie. Of which sort be Lawes and Constitutions, which once inact- ed haue presently existing, yet notwithstanding for want of Execu- tion, that sleepeeth perhaps vpon diuers occasions for many yeares, haue not their continuall working. Now possession being a punish- ment of sinne, and an ordinance of God, is of the seconde kinde, wherein if one shall exa: it one vsuall course to be pra: tised every mo- ment without ceasing, it is as much as to prescribe the Lord & ap- point him when and how he shall inflit his iudgments. What was to haue a more perpetuall existing amongst the people of t e Iewes then the religion of God in those holy rites & ceremonis which himselve had giuen from heauen? Of what were they to expect a more constant and continuall succession, then of their prophets, the Lord hauing promised *he would raise them vp a prophet like to Moses, in whose mouth he would put his words* yet we know what long inter- ruption oft was made by the Idolatry of the people, the wickednes of their kings, and at the last their deserued captivity. Insomuch that the Prophet complauueth *We see not his signes, there is not one Prophet in ye, nor any wis: v: that kn: with him long.* yea from Ma'a- chy til Iohn Bapt st. what long and deepe silence was there, as if the Lordes promises had beene fallen to the ground? So in the Christi- an Church during all the rigne of Antichrist, hath not the truth ly- en hiddē in the wilberne as if it had bene vterly extint & depar- ted from the earth? The Papists cry out vpon vs to shew the visib/o tract of our Church. and you would helpe them with armour, if this might be graunted: *that things perpetuallly existing by ordinance sho- uld also haue a conti- uall working.* I hope nothing ought to be more perpetuall then faith, yet our Saniour demaundeth whether at his coming *he shall finde it on the earth.* The second proposition also is worthely prone. For whereas you should shew that *possessi: n* hath no ordinary working, you tell vs. *It is now adaires so vnwonted and so rare in experience, as veris hard v: it is heard of in twenty y: res space.* Admit this, I hope if it be heard of in twenty yeares it is not a mat- ter so strange for the daies of the Gospell, as you would make it. Neither is *twenty yeares space* such a discontinuance, but that you

Deut. 18. 15.
16.

psal. 74. 9.

Luk. 18. 4.

pag. 178.

might as well conclude the Leprosie, the Cancer, the Apoplexie, & some other rare diseases did all likewise determine with the Apostles time.

Arg 4:
pag 179
& Ans 55.

The fourth argument followeth. *The manifestation of Christ his Deity, & the confirmation of his glorious gospel, were the main causes of possession in Christ his time: these causes being ceased long since, should the effect it self be still continued?*

Ans,

This objection I have already answered in the *Doctrine* pag. 30. 31. 32. where I shew that except these two were the only causes of possession notwithstanding the ceasing of these causes, possession may remaine, y^e lo. g. as an other cause thereof remaineth, to wit, *sinne*. That these were not the sole causes, you your selves do i. effe. c^o esse, in calling them the main causes, and the main ends of possession: & in affirming, that the possession of devils were especially for these two ends. Indee in your *Answer* page 67. (contradicting your selves) you say these were the two only ends of possession. But how prove you that by the Scriptures? Or who made you of counsaile with the Lord, that you doe so peremptorily and precisely put downe these for the sole causes of this iudgment? It is not possible that this which you thus prelumptuously affirme, should be true. Sith (as heretofore I have declared) there were possessions, before either the gospel was preached vnto the Gentiles, or the Lord manifested in the flesh. Moreover the sine of Demoniacks, without which they could neuer have bene vexed by Nathan, was a cause of possession: how then were the two aforesaid, the onely causes of possession? To the former of these reasons you answer, *there were no possessions at all for a y^e long time especially before the coming of Christ*. a childish answer, sⁱng in my said reason I haue made the contrarie euident. Instead of answering my latter reason we haue a slander. You charge me to say, that possession was especially and purposely inflicted upon men for sinne: and this labil of your owne making you labor to ouerthrow. Whereas I onely affirm that besides the aforesaid causes, sinne was a cause, which is the rule of all iudgements, though it alwaies reflect not there principally but sometimes otherwise sⁱnge bⁱst knowe to his l^o.

Doct^rine
Pag 31. 32.

Ans
pag 68.

Ans.
pag: 56

doctrine
Pag 31
* next after
his owne go
rie
page 179
Ioh. 12. 31.

But cheife: you ground the small determination sⁱng since o^r S^au^rs power of possession vpon a blind & misstanding of these words of the gospel. Now is the iudgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. Cōcerning which w^h I consider how many vaine words & causes be sp^et, I call to minde the great paynes the Smith taketh in framing

20. 10. 10

framing his Idolatrous Image. How he *workes in the coles, and fashions it with hammers, and worketh it with the strength of his arms:* Ila: 44: 12.
yet he is *an hungry, & his strength sayeth, he drinketh no water, & is faint:* For these Discourses hauing framed an Idole interpretation in their owne braines, weary themselves to adorne it all that euer they may, though when they haue donne what they can it is nothing else but an abominable frensie, I giue it no harder terme then it deserues. For to come to the matter, these not Euxianours but Prophanours of God his truth would haue the casting forth of the Prince of this world by the death of Christ, to be nothing else but a *small determination of Sathans Actuell possession*, that is, That the benefit of Christ his death should onely pertaine to Demoniacks, men extraordinarylie tormented with the diuel. For the fruite of deliuerance from Actuell possession belongeth onely to such kinde of men. But by these mens Inuinity, I be casting forth of the Prince of this world, is nothing else but a deliuerance from Actuell possession, & to this benefit of Christ his death shall be appropriated to men extraordinarily vexed by Sathan. Are your consciences so seared that you could be content to spoyle Christians of their cheselt comfort? But I neede not spend time in expostulating with you. There is none which leues the truth, but of himselfe will easily acknowledge what such depraours deserue. It shall be enough for me, least any be deceived by your conuince your falshood. Our Sauour sheweth by his owne expresse words, *that the casting forth of the Prince of this world, should be the drawing of all maner of men into him:* for so he speaketh in the next verse. *And he, who were lifted up from the earth, will draw all men vnto me:* which I hope is a more ample fruit of Sathans expulsi- ver: 32.
on: then can be restrained onely to men in vnwonted manner afflicted by him. Likewise the *Grecians* did live to see our Sauour, which occasion did moue this speech, doth manifestly declare it. *casting forth of Sathan should be the admitting of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God.* This also was that which the voice from heauen pronounced, wherein the *name of God* should be glorified, and not the deliuerance of some few speciall men, from this one parte of Sathans tyrannie. Besides our Sauour heere telleth vs that a session and a most solemn iudgement should be holden. wherein the mighty Iehouah sits Iudge. Iesus Christ is plaintiffe and Sathan defendant. Shall we thinke all this solemnity had no other end but onely that Actuell possession might be *indeterminat* rather than the Almighty God iudging the cause betweene his Elect and Sathan, did now in regard of his

his Sonne his merrite fully satisfiing his iustice, giue sentence against Sathan with his chosen, and thereby expell him from that kingdom which heretofore he had generally holden, that in all nations by the preaching of the word, children might be begotten to the Lord. This were sufficient to controuert your wicked error, yet because the matter is waighty, we will consider a place or two more. *S. Paul* to the *Colossians* explaineth this point most fully. And y^e (saith he) which were dead in sinnes, and in the vncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickned together with him, forgiving you all your trespasses, & putting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against vs, &c. And hath spoiled the principallities and powers, and hath made a shew of them openly, & hath triumphed over them in the same crosse. In which wordes, he doth as it were comment vpon this speech of our Saviour declaring *How Sathan is cast forth*: what is the benefit, and to whome it belongeth. The manner of *Sathan* casting forth this, by satisfiing the iustice of god, signified by cancelling the hand-writing, & by spoyling principallities & powers &c. Is the hand-writing cancelled only for *Demoniacks*? That benefit is. A quickning together with *Iesus Christ* and the forgiveness of all trespasses. Are the sinnes of *demoniacks* onely forgiven, and they onely quickned? Nay many which are dispossessed are not quickned with Christ, nor have their trespasses forgiven, but being emptie, swept, and garnished, are repossessed with seauen worse devils then they were at the first. Except perhaps the sentence was only terrible in the time of our Saviours, but now after his death is no more to be feared, possession by your wise interpretation being fully determined. To whom this benefit belongeth, are they which were dead in sinnes, & in the vncircumcision of the flesh. Are onely *Demoniacks* such? Is not this the estate of all the *Elect* before they be called? Thus much *S. Paul*. In the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, likewise the same is most plaine, where it is affirmed, that *Christ* took humane nature vpon him, that in the same he might destroy through death, him that had the power of death, that is the diuel. And that he might deliver all them which for feare of death were all their life time subiect to bondage. where also it is plaine how *Sathan* was throwne out, and that the fruit redounds to all that were oppressed with feare of death, which number is infinite: besides *Demoniacks*. Where it is to be obserued, how these *Discouersers* alleadinge this text, euer when they come to the fiftenth verse, which they see doth vterly ouerthrow them, shrink back againe, not daring to touch it, as if some scorpion lay vnder this

stone

chap: 2: 13

Elect, 2, 24: 15

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

47

stone. which makes me thinke, they doe not so much ignorantly, as of purpose peruert the Scripture. But let vs (by the way) see how they doe vrge this Scripture to their purpose. This word *distruction* (say you) cannot fitly be applyed to *Sathan* his power of obsession, but must necessarily be appropriated to his power of possession, which was not only much maymed, but utterly destroyed by the death of our Saviour, so as now can be posselt now in these daies of the gosp^l. If this here said of the diuel is to be appropriated to the power of possession, the hath Christ destroyed the diuel onely for Demoniacks. By this your interpretation also of the word *destroy*, none can now doe the workes of the diuel, none can at this day lye, flounder, commit murther, whoredome &c. For *Ioh. 3. 8.* it is said that Christ hath appeared to destroy the workes of the diuel, and thus you your selues translate the word, Preist: none of the regenerate can sinne, sith it is said the *old man* (say you) is crucified with Christ, that the body of sinne might be destroyed, but to returne thither whence I have digressed.

pag. 185.

pag. 186.

Rom. 6, 6.

But from the interpretation which you doe giue of *Ioh. 12. 31.* it must necessarily follow, which you also boldly deliuer for truth, that by Christ the power of possession was finally determined, & utterly annihilated, that an end was made of this business. And againe, that our Saviour Christ put a small end to the possession of diuels by his death and resurrection. Now how can this possibly be true, sith after Christ his death and resurrection many were possessed with diuels, as is plaine by the *Actes* of the Apostles? Besides after our Lord was risen he foretels that some beleeuers should in his name cast out diuels. Heerevnto you answering, graunt that there were indeed possessions & dispossessions, a time (that is a little time) after Christ his death & resurrection, for confirmation of his glorious gospel, but none at all for the declaration of Christ his Deitie. But how is it proued? why *M. Deacon* and *M. Walker* say it. That we may plainly see that this is an absurd shift, we must remember that the miracles wrought by the Apostles or others as well after as before Christs death, serued for confirmation of Christ his Deitie. First in that Christ is the subiect or matter of the gospel. That therefore which maketh for the confirmation of the truth of the gospel, (which the miracles wrought by the Apostles after Christs death did, by their owne confession) must needs make for confirmation of this Christ, that he is the true Messiah, and Saviour of the world. And if of Christ, then both of his Deity and humanity. For Christ is a person consisting of these two natures. Again, the gospel teacheth the Deitie of Christ, whatsoever

Ans. pag. 86 :

Mark: 16: 17.

page: 197:

miracles then confirme the gospel, the same confirme *Christs Deity*. Moreouer, the miracles, & namely the dispossessions of the Apostles, or of any other wrought after Christs resurrection, were wrought in the name of Christ, and therefore confirme *Christ his Deity*. In my name (saith Christ) they shall cast out diuels. And this they should doe after his resurrection. I commaund thee (saith Paul) in *Acts 16:18*: the name of Iesus Christ, that thou come out of her, & he came out. Tell me now ye *Discourers*, whether this dispossession of S. Paul and such like dispossessions, performed after Christ his resurrection, whereof we reade in the *Acts*, made not for the confirmation of Christ his deity. Behouide the palpable darknesse that hath couered you: which notwithstanding you seeie not, nor in respect thereof keepe your selues still and quiet without stirring in your places, as the Egyptians did: but you strout it out, and waik bol the, as in the clearest sunn shine, by so much more miserable then the Egyptians were. But if you will be so hardy, you must thanke your selues, if you breake your shinnes, for you can hardly breake your faces, and it may be this doth make you so venterous.

pag 183

You prosecute your absurd interpretation of *Iohn 12*. further by conference of some scriptures; which either you doe not, or will not vnderstand: by a Resolution making little to the purpose, and lastly by the testimonies of diuers: wherein you haue a notable grace, to abuse mens names and wordes contrary to their meanings. Bring one approued author if you can, that restrayneth the casting out of the Prince of the worlde, to the deliuerance of demoniackes, and to the ending or finall determination of possessiō: which if you cannot, what a shame is it, or rather a wickednes not to be borne, to soyst in the names of good Authors, and some scattered patches of sentences founding contrary to their iudgments, to deceaue the simple, and to draw them into error? Are you men appointed to be leaders of the blinde, and doe you willingly digge pitts for them? The Lord deliuer his people from such pastors which stop their mouthes with grauel instead of bread, and kill them with the poyson of their owne erroneous conceits, instead of feeding them with the wholesome foode of God his truth. My purpose is not to enter any particuler examination of your allegations. For euen as one when he was inioyned to carry away a dunghill, after he considered how huge and foule it was, neuer put to his shoulders, but opened a passage to a riuer not far of, by the flowing wherof he swept it away: So I, when I perceaued how wearisome and vnprofitable it would

would be to ranfack to the bottome this heape of trumpery, thinke it better, rather then to remoue all this baggage, in stead of water to put fier to it, which happely might make fome speedy riddance of fuch ftuff, and thus much for this Dialogue.

A Survey of the Seauenth Dialogue.

In this Dialogue of *common experience*, Whether *Actuall* Possession of Spirits may be or no, I expected fome prooffe that the poffeffions mentioned by *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Chryfoftome*, and fo till our owne times, were all but counterfeyt, and therefore no reason to thinke any other of *Somners* at *Nottingham*. But as *Apothecaries* boxes carry titles of *Aloes*, *Styrax*, *Benjoin*, and within haue nothing but black leade, *copporas*, *Ockar*, and fuch trath: fo heere we haue a title of *common experience*, without any experience at all, not any one approued example once sifted and conuicted. Yet to examine fuch as you bring: Firft you will proue *Actuall* Poffeffion cannot be, becaufe as great or greater workes are done by nature, Art, & Sickneffe. Surely this cannon makes a foule battery, not onely o uerthrowing this poffeffion at *Nottingham*, but all other elfwhere in the world, yea thofe that are mentioned in the fcripture. It behoues vs therefore to fortify what we can againft fo daungerous a fhott, or elfe all is like to goe to ruine. What then are the workes of nature? Diuers are reckoned out of *Pliny*, *Strabo*, and others, whereby you would conclude, that if the boy at *Mahgnitton* had breathed out flames of fier, it had bene no worke of actuall poffeffion, becaufe *Aetna* doth fo: If he had bene able to draw yron vnto him, in fomuch that if your felues had come in place, becaufe your faces are of this mettall you fhould haue iowled foreheads with him: yet this had bene no wonder, becaufe the *Magnes* doth fo: If by his imbracing one *A. Walker* he fhould fo violently haue detayned him, that he could not poffibly make one ftep forward towards *Ireland*, this had bene no maruaille at all, becaufe the little fifh *Echneis* is able to flay a fhip of great burthen neuer fo flete vnder fayle. VVhy, you *Discourfers*, things are not maruelous, except to the ignorant, wh̄ they worke according to kinde: but when they goe beyond their naturall ability, though the aⁿtions be not comparable to others in nature, they are wonderfull. It is no ftrange thing for the Sunne to lighten the whole oppofite face of the earth, and yet if *Mofes* face fhine, the people are afraid. You remember out of *Auguftine* other

page 102.

page 102.
Aug. de ciuit.
lib. 2. c. 23.

workes

workes of nature very strange done by men. Put what of them I pray you? Were *Somers* actions also naturall? Naturall actions shew themselves from the cradle, to the grave: whereas *Somers* before the time of his first vexation by Sathan could never doe any of the. But you will say, that which is done naturallly by one, by art and practise may be done by another. It would be hard for you to prove that those workes which *Augustine* mentioneth, could be imitated by any art though I confesse strange things may be done by eolening and practise, as *Eusebius* and *Christostome* doe both teach: notwithstanding they both acknowledge a ctuall possession, which easely may be discerned from artificiall workinges. for in these be teachers, long exercise, some end of glory or gaine with divers other circumstances, whereas the possessed selfe neither profit nor credit, but fall into strange passions in a moment without school-masters, or any former exercise. The *Spanes* were wiseden to vse this silly shift to discredit our Saviour his miracles by which was ready at hand, if it had bene of any force I would say you *flagger* *afflictions* often arise from more naturall diseases. It is true, but because you shew not these things in *Somers* to have proceeded from naturall disease, you abuse your Reader with idle wordes. It might be apparant to you they came not from disease, for that he was relieved from his vexation in a moment, without any ordinary means of phisick, as likewise *Dawling* of *Burton* was and the *Seaven* in *Lancashire*. Moreover, if their strange effects came from some naturall disease, then did they not counterfeyt. If they counterfeited, then had they no disease, but were in good health I trust. Reconcile the together I pray you: and if you will contend still for counterfeiting, give over your prating of naturall diseases for shame.

Secondly you reason from the naturall power of the Diuell, that he cannot effect such things as are reported to be done by *Somers*, & therefore there was no actuall possession. And wherefore could he not effect such things? Because say you the diuell cannot doe workes impossible in nature. Heere we must demand of you what you meane by workes impossible in nature: whether impossible to the nature of a diuell, and nature generally, or impossible to the nature of the man, in whome he worketh. In the former sence, we know the Diuell hath a restraint: in the second, he may inable a man to breake chaynes, which by his owne naturall strength he cannot possibly doe, & that is as vnpossible to be done by man, as any of the things we report by *Somers*. Now whether of the two meanings doe you follow?

Eusebius pr.
Euang. lib. 4:
cap. 1.
Chry. ad pop.
pul. Antioch.
hom: 20

pag. 206.

pag. 208.

Marke 5, 4

follow^d forsooth both: In the *Major* the first, and in the *Minor* the second. Therefore I answer you, because you shoote in a bow with two strings, I will stand out of your way, as most perillous archers, able to kill the man in the moone. Again, say you, *in all sound Divinity there is an impossibility of such actions, because the Diu. is no Creator of substances, no transfuser of names, no worker of miracles.* If you would haue distinguished your tearmes, and then haue spēt some wordes to make plaine, that in these actions there was such a *creation*, such a *transfamation*, such a *miraculous working*, as could not be incident to the power of the diuel, I w^old haue shapd you an answer if I could: but because you make a confused noyse, as if you were ringing of bees, you shall swarme them vpon what bough you will for all me: Nay but say you, *if the diu. did such things once, he can doe them againe.* It may be he can, and would too, if he were at any mans commaund like an ape to shew tricks. It may be also that sometimes he doth them, though all the world heare not therof. That which you bring of his being *to make an Agent*, for that he is not Omnipotent, as if an Omnipotence were required in these actions, is miserable beggery, still crauing that which will not be granted you. If you will not be answered, you would like importunate beggars be set in the stocks. Touching the aptesse you deny to be in the *young man at Mahomet* to those *supernaturall actions*, I answer, There is little aptesse in a stone, or in a man to fly aloft in the aer, yet violence doth make them doe that, vnto which they be not naturally fit. But what are those actions which could not and haue not bene wrought by spirits in mens bodies? Haue you forgotten how you would make vs beleue, that greater workes then any was done in *Somers*, are vsually done by nature, by art, by sickness? Are mens bodies not capable of such workes of Sathan, as *praefise*, *disease*, or nature effecteth in them? For your application of *matter & forme* we haue spoken sufficiently in the question of *assimilating bodies*. Surely your faculty in logick is exceeding great, which contrary to the iudgment of sence in proper obiects, and other things requisite rightly disposed, will force reason to a Non plus. O that you had liued in those daies, when they disputed whether Snow is white. No doubt by your good helpe the *Academicks* had preuailed, whatsoeuer sence saith. But still you vrge the matter further by *Divinity*, *Philosophy*, *Physick*, *Law*, *Conscience*. If *Divinity* the Mistres condēne these actions, you might wel haue spared the other fve her hand-maides. But you are like new wine tunned vp in vessels, you must

page 209.

page 210

page 211

page 211, &
212.

either vent, or burst. What then saith Diuinity? *working of miracles is ceased long since*: But the things wrought in *Somers* by the diuell were miracles, or else you say vntruly. If you be such vnreasonable beggars, that no answer will serue you, you woulde be cudgelled from the dore. For the handmaids I will not talke with them: their Mistresse hath receaued answer for all. Lastly to auoyd need elsse speach, I will not graunt you, neither shall you euer be able to wrig from me, That *diuels* can bring to passe such things at their pleasure, or if they wrought these actions in *Somers*, that therefore they can stop the ordinary course of all other naturall actions, and ordinances appointed by God. You were sick of a feuer, when you tyed these consequences together. The Diuels power is a limyted power. He can not touch one haire of our heades turther then his commission serueth him. Thus much for the diuels power.

page 213.

page 214.

Thirdly you reason from the distribution of actions, & causes of right iudgment. If (say you) these actions in *Somers* were true actions, then were they either naturall, or not naturall: and then either against nature, or besides nature, or aboue nature, to be discerned all by one rule of truth, which either nature affordeth (by inbred principles Theoricall, & practicall, or got by experience of sence, of History, of Induction, or of our owne Tryall) or else at least is supernaturallly giuen vs: but none of all these were to be seene in *Somers* actions, and therefore no true actions. I answer, there was to be seene in him Actions against nature, as when he went about to hang himselfe, though you fondly imagine it was no such action, because it was not effected: there were actions in him besides nature, when his face and mouth were monstrously distorted, one lip towards one eare, and the other towards the other: there were actions aboue nature, in his strength, in his knowledg, in his sundry passions, as of a lump about as big as an egge mouing along his legg, belly, throat, and other partes. so that this portion of your prooffe is patched vp altogether with vntruthes. Now for your rule of iudgment, you affirme, these actions of *Somers* could not be iudged by any Theoricall and Practicall principles. Your reason is, because Theoricall and Practicall principles be only naturall, and *Somers* actions were supernaturall. Surely this might be the reason also of meere Naturalls. As if *Rectum* is not *Iudex sui et obliqui*. If naturall principles iudge what is accordinge to nature, the same principles shall also iudge what is aboue nature. Doe you thinke heathen Philosophers were not able to discern what worke was supernaturall? Was Aristotle a foole in writing Metaphisicks? But what of Experience?

pag 218.

THE 7: DIALOGVE.

53

riences? It is not *uniuersall* (say you) because *diuers amongst you where the thing was done, did not acknowledge such experimented tryalls of an actual possession.* Indeed the Pharises if it could haue bene brought to passe, by no meanes would haue had the blinde mans eyes opened by our Sauour Christ. And in Nottingham it was apparant that Papisme, prophane life, & anger for hauing some of their frendes touched, caused some to oppose themselves. Then for the *seuerall degrees of experience, it could not (say you) be determined by sence, because the objects of sence were deccatable.* I answer, you say vntruly: The objects of sence were true objects. For sence apprehendeth but the outward appearance, which semblance is true, though the inward substance be not that, which yourward likenesse sheweth to be. Hath not the Lord set his bow in the cloudes, though it be but an appearance onely to sence through the repercussion of the sunne beames, in a subiect fitly disposed, and that there is no such thing existing really indeede. Doe not spirits appeare to men, though the bodyes they seeme to haue, oft be no true bodies, but onely carry the similitude and image of them? your other partes of *experience* be ydle, for *History* and *Induction* could haue no place in one present *Individuum*, and *Triall* which consisteth in *proofe of action*, might happily be in *Somers* himselfe, but not in the behoulders. These actions then haue store of naturall proofe, howsoeuer your eyes dimmed through enuy or couetousnes and desire of preferment, cannot behold it.

After you come to your *Supernaturall rule*, from whence you would conclude, *There is at this day no actual possession, because S. Paul hauing shewed the Ephesians the whole counsaile of God, giues neither Canon nor Counsell of Actual Possessions.* It is vntrue, that you say. For as in visiting of the sick, and diuers other such christian duties, there is nothing expresly set downe, but is onely to be gathered by implication & found deduction, so likewise in this of *possession*: Concerning which he hath generally admonished vs, *To put on the whole armour of God.* In which wordes he comprehendeth all vexation of Sathan whatsoever, and sheweth also in the words following the remedy. Except you can make good vnto vs, that possession is none of the Engines to ouerthrow man withall. VWhereas you require *some precept of this matter to Timotheus & Titus*, you are to vnderstand that the ordinary guilt is not peculiar to the Minister, but common to all beleeuers: And therefore no maruaile if there be *no speciall precept of this*, more then of visiting the sycke, redeeminge

page 226.

page 223.
Act. 20. 27.

Eph. 6. 11

releuing captiues, releuing decayed persons, and such like: in which duties all Christians haue interest, and not onely the Ministers. Again you say, that if perpetuity of *Actual possession* be either expressly, or implicatly contained in the word, then also the miraculous faith is either expressly or implicatly contained in the word: which is stark false, as you and your fellows haue bene told an hundred times, considering miraculous faith is not necessarily required for dispossession, as (God willing) may be shewed more at large in the ninth dialogue. Thus then haue the euen reasoned against experience, and haue afforded vs three general arguments to disprove all Possessions by, & as well as that of *Ntingham*.

doctrine
pag 28.
Inter Ep.
Cyprian. Ep.
75

But seeing they haue failed to no purpose of Experience, I will in one word commend to the Christian Reader these Experiences following, besides those mentioned in the *Doctrine*, for his better satisfaction in this point. And first of the possessed woman of whose *Fornications* doth treat at large in his Epistle to Cyprian: an example out of the compasse of that time, where with these *Discourers* would bound all *Actual possession*. But what neede I stand vpon former times? If possession be apparant in these our daies, it must needs be that neither hath it ceased in ages past. To come then to our own times, & with one bush to stop two gappes. Examples we haue in our owne country, as in *Margaret Harrison* of *Burnham Vlpe* within the county of *Norfolk*, in *Kath. Wright*, in *M. Throckmorton* children *Th. Darling* of *Burton*, the seauen in *Lancashire*, *One* *lorden* the seru-
uant of *Symon Fox* of *Shadbrook* in *Sussex*, whose cause was heard before the Right Ho: the *L. Chief Justice* of England at *S. Edmundsbury* the 12. of Iuly 1599. *Ioane Naylor* as was proued before the Right Ho: the *L. Audyson* Novem. 30 the same yeare. *Susan By-
ton* of *Saffron Walden* in *Essex*, as is plaine by the euidence giuen against *Alice Bentley* at the Quarter Sessions holden at the afore-
said *Walden* the 13. day of April 1602. which *Susan* was lately dis-
possessed, the meanes being ved which God hath to that end ap-
pointed. Also in *Th. Harrison* of *North Wych* in *Cheshire*, & in *Cle-
mens Charles* a maid of *Wolroytch* commonly called *Wullage* in *Kent*:
both which be at this present very greuously vexed by *Sathan*, so
as he that will may be an eye witnesse thereof. Out of our owne
countrey, as at *Spandaw* a towne fixe miles from *Brandenburg* in
Germany in the yeare (as I take it) 1594. the diuel did walke visi-
bly, and possessed more then twenty men, vexing them in misera-
ble sort. Yea he scattered in the publike streetes mony, boxes, golde
& siluer

Gallebelg.
libra

THE 6. DIALOGVE.

55

& filuer buttons, and such like: and he that gathered any of these things was presently vexed by the diuel. Wherevpon it was forbidden both in the schooles & churches, that none should take vp any such scattered things. The like were done by wicked spirits at *Berlin* in the same *Marqua* ship of *Brandenburgh*: And at *Fridberge* a towne of the new *Martha*, there were more then an hundreth and fifty men, of either sex, condition, & age, which were possessed with wicked spirits. These things are testified by *D. James Coler* *Provoost* in *Berlin*, and *M. Robert Coler*, and *M. James Pretor* Pastors of the Church in *Spandavia*. To whose Narration *Balthasar Westphalus*, and *John Muller* Consuls of *Spandaw* haue subscribed. *John Fernclius* a man worthy to be credited for his famous learning, place, and deserved authority, throughout all Christendome: reporteth of two possessed, one taken in the night, when as by occasion of immoderate thirst he rising out of his sleepe, and finding no drinke, bit of an apple that he hit on by chance, wherewith presently he perceaued his iawes to be shut, & as it were strangled with ones hand, & with all, he being now possessed of a diuel entring into him, did seeme to behold himselfe in the dark to be deuoured by a mighty black dog which thin's saith he, afterwards when he was restored to his perfect minde, he reported to vs in order. The other was a Knight his sonne, taken in such sort, that sometimes his left arme, sometimes his right, sometimes one finger, one whiles one thigh, one otherwhile both, sometimes the whole body was greuously vexed: which torment passed with so great swiftnes, & shaked him so vehemently, that hardly foure seruants could hould him in his bed. The most skilfull phisitions iudged it a conuulsion, hauing next affinity with the Epilepsy, and so accordingly directed their practise, but without any successe at all. The reason was (saith he) for that we were all deceaued in the true iudgment of the Cause. For in the third moneth a wicked spirit was found to be the author of all the euil, bewraving himselfe by a voice, and vnwonted words & sentences both Latine and Greeke, although the sick party was ignorant of the Greeke tongue. He discovered many secrets of them that sate by, and especially of the Phisitions, laughing that he had deceaued them in a matter of so great perrill, and that they had almost killed that poore body with their vnprofitable medecynes. These examples alleadged giue vs euident proofe of possessions in these daies. Now let the Reader choose whether he will beleue these testimonies and experiences, or the vnlauiory and vnlearned

de Abdituri
caus. lib. 2. c. 16:

I r

disputations

disputations of these *Discourses*.

Page 12. 6.

Cyprian. ad De
mestri.
De oper. lib.
4. Cap. 10.

Hitherto of *Possession*, now they turne themselves to *Obsession*, vnskillfully oppoled, as hath bene partly shewed, to *Possession*. For they which treat of these matters vie these wordes indifferently. Cyprian saith, *And by the torments of wordes they are cast forth of Obsessed bodyes*. So *Ferninus* in the place before cited, *And without he being now obsessed by the diuel entering into him*. Likewise *Zanchius* (as before we heare) speaking of auels substantially entering into bodyes, calles it by the name of being *Obsessed by duels*. And indeede *Obsidere* doth not onely signifie to besiege, and to compassse about, but also *Tenere*, *Occupare*, *Opprimere*, to Hold, *Possesse*, & *Oppress*, as when *Sully* saith, *Cum is qui audit ab Oratore iam obsessus est ac teneur*: When the bearer is now possessed and held by the Orator. And it seemeth that writers rather vie the word *Obsessed* then *Possessed* partly for comfort of the afflicted, teaching them they are not absolutely in the duels power, howsoeuer he thus furiously rageth in their bodies, but rather that he now seeketh to vanquish them, then that without all hope they be vanquished already: partly also for the better sound. These *Discourses* in a priuate vnderstanding make *Obsession* nothing else but an outward assault of *Sathan*, which onely power they leaue vnto him now. And where it is objected, This doth open a dore to *Athiesme*, they returne this imputation very wisely vpon the doctrine of possession: as it to teach both inward and outward vexation were a doctrine of more security, then theirs of outward temptation onely. It had wont to be an old laid saw in *Geomitry*, the part is lesse then the whole: but these men will refine all Artes, & teach vs a new, That the parte is more then the whole. And so let this memorable *Exercise* shut vp this dialogue.

A Survey of the Eighth Dialogue.

Page 13. 1.

Haui'g bewrayed your great ignorance concerning the power of *Sathan*, you come to talke how this power is to be subdued: where-in you shew your selues as blinde, if not also obstinate and peruerse, as you haue in that already passed. Much lauish speech is in the beginning, wherewith I will neither trouble my selfe, nor the Reader. Onely we may noate by the way, how vntruly you require for the subduing of actuall possession an extraordinary power: concerning which we shall see in that which followeth. Then you sling out, as your custome is, against the worke at *Nottingham*, because (say you)

Cryinge

THE 8. DIALOGVE.

57

Crying aloud, vending sore, & leaving as dead be made vndoubted true
 signes of that dispossession. whereas the same things are scene in *Mania*,
 (and sometimes a *Mania* without them as in your selues) in *Phren*
sies, in the *Mother*, in *Convulsions* &c. I answer, I neither make these
 the onely, nor the necessary signes of dispossession: for I know di-
 uers haue bene wrought without them: but I frame my reald thus.
Where these signes be, & a present deuerrance doth follow from those &
former vexations by Sathan, vpon the request of God his people, that
there is a dispossession. I contelle these signes particuierly may be in
 diuers diseases, but they are not from the diuel: neither is there a
 present restoring of the parties diseased in naturall sicknes vpon the
 vying of earnest prayer.

I holde meanes for dispossession which you stand vpon, I allow
 not. They be not *Rings*, *Rooses*, nor *Hearbes*, that be of any auayle
 in this worke. Neither doe we vrge the *fishes liner* nor *Dauids harp*,
 nor the *musick wherewith Eljbas Spirit was calmed*: and therfore all
 this as superfluous talke, nothing perteyninge to this cause I omit.
 But we cleaue onely to God his owne ordinance of prayer, holpen
 forward by the Exercise of fasting, which according to his gracious
 promise & mercy we haue proued to be effectuell. Against which,
 before you encounter with your full strength, you sporte your
 selues with a prophane scoffing in the end of this dialogue. And fir-
 st, you wil needes wring from me whether I wil or no, that the
 worke done at *Nottingham*, was done onely by fasting. You are able to
 wring *Hercules* his club out of his fist. You haue proued your selues
 such exceeding sharp Logicians in the former Discourses, that I stand
 in great feare of you: yet now I must endure the brunt of it, come
 what wil, Go to then, bring forth your wringer. This then is it, That
 which made the prayer more forcible, & the spirit more apt, was the onely
 efficient cause of the supposed action: But your fasting made your prayer
 more forcible &c. & therfore was the efficient cause of the action. This
 is a wringer indeede. If *Cardane* were aliue he would register this
 Practicall Theoreme in the booke of his Subtilties. What a profit
 would this proposition well vnderstood, bring to many artificers?
 It would ease them of great expence in prouiding many tooles. The
 Carpenter might spare his axe and chisels, and goe to fell timber,
 square logs, and doe his other workes with his onely whetstone.
 For that which makes the axe and chisell more forcible is the onely
 efficient of the worke. And so by this vnanwerable reason I am
 made a *Montanist*, a *Papist*, & one that makes fasting a sufficiēt meanes
 in it selfe

page 240

page 241

in page 260

page 257

page 257

page: 259.

page: 260

in it selfe, for suppressing of all suggested actuell finnes whatsoeuer: which opinion though I am far from, yet if you wil follow my counsaile M. Deacon, for some things that I know, you should fast more then you doe. Againe you are instant to know, If prayer be a meanes, in what order of meanes I woulde place it. Not in that sure which you foolishly fancy to your selues, For what childe woulde esteeme of praier as a meere naturall action? But this is suteable to your other blinde ignorances. Further you argue, that prayer can be no meanes, whether we respect the S und, the Voyce, or the wordes: wherein you shew your selues no lesse voyd of piety, then you haue bene hither to of wit and learning. Can you not be content to reproch me, but you must needes open your mouthes against the holy worship of God? Can you finde no other causes wherefore prayer shoulde be effectually, but onely for a noyse that is made, or for some distinct voyce, or else for certaine charming words? In which of these respects consisteth the power of ordinarie prayer? you must needes answer, It consisteth in none of them: Conclude then, that ordinary praier is but lip labour. Your audaciousnes is intollerable: In this 260. page you carry your selues moe like Athiests, then Preachers. It is a shāe your booke was not better examined before it was allowed to the presse. But thus hauing brandished your sword about your eares, you make an end of this foolish talke, and prepare your selues to other as good.

A Survey of the Ninth Dialogue.

page: 263

page: 292.

*This Dialogue aymes at two poynts, That Prayer & fasting be not establisht by Christ, as a perpetuall ordinary meanes for powerfull expelling of diuels: That iustificing faith apprehending some supernaturall power of God, doth not effect that worke. For the first, the Reader must take heede, he vnderstand not prayer and fasting, as I meane it, and we all vsually doe, for an effectuall ordinaunce of God to quicken faith by, which is our onely apprehender of God his mercies, in these and all other actions, but for a bare and meere naked performance of these workes of Fasting & Prayer: For so these Trisellers expound themselves, some fiftene leaues after. Which disputation might haue had some vse against Papists, that mainteine their *Opus operatum*, an efficacy of the worke done, for the onely workes sake: but in what stead can it serue against me? It may be they intended it against Papists, these Discomfisers propounding*

THE 9. DIALOGVE.

59

ding to themselves the generall doctrine of Spirits: but neither doe their arguments prelle them at all, & besides they apply their whole course of speech against that done at *Nottingham*. So then they dispute against me in words, but not indeede, thereby labouring to deceiue the reader, not able, as they thought, to distinguish betweene these two. If you had ment plainly, you would haue shewed in what sence you had dealt in this place: but it was shamefull to expresse it, for so you should haue appeared to all worthy to be hissted at. And therefore you deferre your explication til some thirty pages after, where no man would looke for it, that in the meane season you might seeme to be talking, and yet at last haue a runninge knot on your iugling stick to play fast and loose with at your pleasure. Should any man bestow time against persons of such peruerie trade, that are corrupted in their minde, and are deprived of the truth? I assure thee good reader, every lyne seemes a page vnto me, yet least thou shouldst be deceaued by these Huchlers dealing, I put my self to these paines. Wee then to come to the first poyn, If you can say any thing, wherefore *fasting and prayer accompanied with weeping* (saith he) is not a perpetuall meanes ordeyned by Christ for expelling diuels let vs heare what it is.

1 Tim. 4.5

There is no commandment (say you) or canon any where expressed in all the Scriptures for the approbation of it. page 164.

Because it seemes you haue bene seeking and can finde none, I will shew you some. Our Saviour teaching vs to pray, *And leade vs not into temptation but deliuer vs from euil*, doth therein teach vs to pray against actuall possession. It was as an euil you confesse, where with many in his time and after were troubled. Neither may we thinke the forme giuen by our Saviour, is any thing defective, as if some part of our necessity were omitted. If then prayer be a meanes to defend and preserue from actuall possession, it is also a meanes to deliuer from the same, if at any time we be ouertaken with it.

And seeing also possession is still remaining in the church, as hath bene proued by vnanswerable arguments, it must needes be also, the remedy of prayer is still remaining, and warranted from hence.

Again, *This kind goeth not forth (saith he) but by fasting and prayer.* Math. 17.21.

To this place you answer, That our Saviour onely makes knowne the impediment in that action, but puts downe no commandment. And page 164

here you condemne me of grosse ignorance that could not see this. I contrariwise admire your superabundant skill, that is able to make two things iustle out one another without any opposition. I

1.2

pray

pray your great learning teach me (for of my selfe I can not conceaue) How the presence of that thing should not be a meanes, an helpe, a furtherance, the absence whereof is a let, an hindrance, an impediment. Or how a defect can be reprov'd, but that a supply of the same defect should withall be commaunded. And how an euill can be perpetuall, as I haue shewed a tuall possession is, & that the remedy should not also be perpetuall, considering the Lord is more ample in mercy towards vs, then in iustice. Besides, if neither we are to haue any vse of fasting and prayer in these actions, nor the Apostles euer vsed them in casting out diuels (at least we neuer reade that they did) how might the Church reape profit of this instruction? Did our Saviour giue precepts, that were vaine and superfluous? Or was this instruction proper to that one action and neuer to come in vse afterwards? I beseech you make not want of your skill, but lighten my ignorance in these points.

Eph. 6:13

Moreover, whereas you require *some testimony for this ordinance in Paul his epistles*, and for want of such doe thereupon conclude that there is no such ordinance. I answer, it is not necessary we should proue this ordinance out of the epistles of S. Paul. May not warrant for it out of the gospel suffice? And *cannons & rules* thence for our direction therein? If you can proue that all the ordinances of God whatsoeuer, be conteyned in Pauls epistles: I will eyther from thence proue this ordinance, or confesse that there is no such ordinance. Yet notwithstanding know ye, that where the Apottle speaking of the compleat armour of Christians against the diuel, requireth that we *pray with all manner of prayer and supplication in the spirit*, that from thence this ordinance hath confirmation. Let this then be a third place. And where you adde that *the Apottle in the epistles to Timothy and Titus handles at large all Church offices and officers*; I haue already shewed that expelling of diuels is no peculiar duty of any Church officer: and therefore you haue no reason to looke for this precept amongst the aduertisements of their charge.

Eph. 6:18

Again you object S. Peter that *laying on the perpetuall vnciuies of Satan to kill & deuour, be maketh no mentio of prayer & fasting, but only of a strong faith*. I answer, The reason of this was, because S. Peter was not aware of that variance betwene faith & prayer, which your Eagle eyes haue elpyed: who as it seemeth can haue a faith without prayer, and prayer without faith. He thought simply as he had learned, that where he spake of faith, men would also haue vnderstood all the helpes and furtherances of faith, & not by the name

the name of faith destroy whatloeuer might giue maintenance to it. But because you stand so strictly vpon the word *prayer*, take this for a fourth place. Is any among you afflicted let him pray: Shall we thinke that possession is no affliction? Or that in this affliction onely we are barred from praier? Or if we doe pray, that it shall be to no effect. Now then you may see, that you casting your net, and for all your draggingge findinge nothing in all the canonicall scripture for this ordinance, it was not for want of troare, whereof I haue giuen you but a tast that you drew vp empty to land, but because you had so many floters in the top, and wanted leade to sinke it a conuenient depth.

Iames 5, 13

Whereas therefore you challenge me for proofes of this institution, these places may suffice for authority of scriptures. And might not those testimonies of antiquity, and of present practise with the godly now aciaies content you, which I haue alleadged in the *Doctrine*, but that you must blazon me for a *Braver* in wordes, which neither had brought any thing to purpose, nor possibly could bring. Say you. *we wonder you blush not to brane out the matter, by pretending the authority of Scriptures, the testimony of fathers olde and new, the practise of the church, and the good success thereof, to mannage the matter it selfe.* I beseech thee good Reader let me by thy patience remember some part of that already set downe in the *Doctrine*, wherebv thou maist better behould these mens vn honest dealines, and whether I meerely pretend these things as they tell thee. First there-

page, 165.

page, 55.

fore I haue cited *Origen*, speaking to this effect: If at any time wee shall deale about the curing of the possessed, we (continuing in prayer & fasting) may obteyne helpe from God for them: & shall drive forth the wicked spirit by fasting and prayer. Next *Tertullian*, who saith, We expell diuels out of men, as is knowne to many. Then *Cyprian*, saying, diuels are cast out of bodies possessed. Fourthly *Chrysostome*, out of whose testimony there cited at large, these wordes be part: So the fathers haue appointed, that men vexed by the diuel shoulde be brought forth, that the people and all the city being present, publike prayers might be made for them, that all with one accord might intreat the Lord in their behalf, and might shoute with strong crye, that the Lord would haue mercy vpon them &c. Fifthly *Peter Martyr*, concerning men possessed, vsing these wordes We will vse for them faithfull prayers, I say, *Peter Martyr* prayers most rehent, & supplications for their recovery. In a word, that should be the most laudable & wise course, that exorcismes at this day be turned into prayers. Sixthly, *Chemisius*, who saith, That in the time of

Orig in mat.
17, 21.
Tertul in apo
log. 8. ad Sca
pul cap. 3.
Cyprian ad
Demetri.
Ch. ystostom
co. de inco
pre. Dei natu
ra homin 3.

Dei 2. 4. cap. 2.
sect. 13.
chemis de
sacra ordinis

Christ: me

Christosome and Prosper the possessed were brought into the Church, and were oft deliuered by the common supplications of the assembly. Seauenthly, Philip Melancthon making mention of diuers which were possessed, and namely of a damel in Mantua, that had bene healed of that disease by the prayers of the godly, of whome he saith, Et adhuc uiuit, iana, and yet she liueth and continueth sound: which was 17. yeares after the cure. Vsing further these wordes, Neither indeede doe I doubt but that euil may be taken away, and the diuels expelled by the prayer of the godly. And a few lynes after, I know many examples a herein it is certaine the prayers of the godly preuayled. Eightly Theod. Beza, writing thus, I know a certaine householder in France indued with the knowledge of the gospel, and which had embraced the same: who when in anger he had giuen one of his children to the diuels had his sonne presently possessed of the diuel: out of whome after he was call by the seruent and vncessant prayers of the church. Nynthly Vogellius affirming that for casting out of diuels, there is not a better and more godly way at this day, then that Christ sitting at the right hand of the father, be called vpon, not onely by the priest, but of the possessed, but also of the whole church, with a fervent heart & be put in minde of his omnipotency & mercy, whereby onely at this day, the vnclean spirits are cast forth. Tenthly Dancæus saying, we restore by fasting and prayer (which he that prayeth doth) diuels may be cast forth, that is: with the loue, interuall, & fervent prayers of the possessed man, and also the church, as are these which are tryed with fasting &c. Lastly Chassanion auouching thus, This onely remedy remaineth to vs, whereby we might to helpe these kinde of men. (viz. possessed) worthy of commiseration, to wit that with fervent prayers we pray for their deliurance. So I heard that a Demoniack was deliuered in a certaine towne within the Dolphyns prouince. These testimonies haue I alleadged in the Doctrine: and vnto these can adioyne more. But to what purpose, these remaining vnanſwered? Now then you Discouers, whereas I affirmed, that both the auncient Doctors, & the lights of our owne time did witness with me in this point, was this nothing but a Thraſon call vaunt, as you tearme it? Or huge bragging barrells, that would neuer be set on broadens and professe that did bene in calamity, cleane so close to the pen, that they could procure no publique passage? Are most plaine and euident testimonies of truth to be shifted of in this manner? you are like the malefactors which knowing themselves sure to be cast by the lury, refuse the ordinarie trvall by God & the country, and will be tryed by no other meanes but by God and the Queene: So you in a desperate case woulde

fayne

Phil. Melanct.
lib. epistol

Berz homil.
26. in histor.
paul edit. 2.
page 56.

Vogell in
thesaur theol.
log. 22. 280

Dancæus 38
in Marc.

Chassanion in loc.
com. lib. 1.
cap. 17

page, 166:

gaine some time and dally of the verdict ready to condemne you, by requiring some other course, which you thinke is not present. To the end therefore your notorions impudency may be had in remembrance, let there be a publike instrument drawne to this effect.

Be it known vnto all men by these presentes, that Iohn Deacon and Iohn Walker, vnworthely reputed Ministers, hauing had the cleare euidence of truth passed against them, and being neither able to answer one word, nor induring to submit themselves thereunto, as they ought, are two shamelesse beastes, which with branded consciences, and whorish fortheades, haue soulded them selues to face out a lye, to deceiue the simple with. In witnesse whereof all the learned of this land, which shall consider the allegations against you, and your paltry answers, will in consent of mindes subscribe to these presentes, that they are true. Let this then suffice for the prooffe of that I haue brought, and so I will proceede to examine yours.

You cite M. Calvin against actual fasting alone, as an effectual counterpoison for the expelling of Satan, as it is mainteyned by the Papists. What is this to me you *Discourser*? Haue I any where said it, or shewed it by practise, that *the very worke of fasting and prayer without faith is sufficient in this businesse*? Or doth M. Calvin speake against fasting and prayer being ioyned with faith? What impudent men are these that dare offer such a thing so palpable to the view of the world? The hare is neere driuen that is faine for refuge to run betwene the hunters leggs, and your case is desperate, that seekes releife at such a testimonie. Then you cite M. Bullinger as if he also should say, that *prayer & fasting is not here prescribed as a perpetuall canon*. I graunt as M. Bullinger vnderstandeth it, that is, *It is not prescribed as a perpetuall canon to exorcists*. Our sauour doth not here institute a new office in the Church, but this makes nothinge against the common duty of christians, that they in their assemblies whether greater or lesse, should vse prayer & fasting in this behalf. So likewise D. Fulk is to be vnderstood, out of whome you cannot shew one sillable against these holy exercises of the congregation, but as they are appropriated to the persons of Exorcists.

After this dispute you fall a jangling against me, condemning me as a *busy bodie for intermedling in this action at Nottingham*. But you might vnderstand if malice would let you, that I pressed not into this businesse, but was drawne into it. I tooke vpon me no faculty

curtie aboute others, but was willinge after much intreaty to ioyne with my bretheren in so charitable a worke: I disordered no ecclesiastical gouernment of our Church, but being allowed a Minister of the Gospell, I did no more then my place would warrant. What meane you then vpon this occasiō to let slie at Christ his sacred discipline? Is the disgracing of his ordinance that which must win you your spurs? I know the shadow of discipline is terrible vnto you.

See pag 370.

But it were happy for you, if you might tast of her severity, that you might escape his, which accounts not mans negligence, & his winking at our crimes for payment. I will not presse you further this way. The Lord giue you hearts of flesh, that the works of flesh being destroyed in you, your soules & bodies may be safe in the day of his iudgment.

pag 371

de vita solit.
cap. 2

Whereas you cauill against prayer and fasting, that it is no meanes to expel Satan, because the effect doth not presently follow: what ignorance or proud presumption is this, when the Lord himselfe praieth, *Not my will, but thine be done*, the seruant should absolutely and presently exact the thing he craves, without respect of the lord his pleasure at all? *When thou askest* (saith Basil) *that which is meete to aske at the Lord his hands, cease not till thou hast receaued it: perhaps for that cause he giues thee not presently, that he may teach thee perseverance, and that thou maist learne what the gust of God is, and when it is giuen thee thou maist keepe it with feare.* Hither to goeth the prooffe of the first generall argument against prayer and fasting.

page. 374

The second is, *that prayer & fasting haue no power proceedinge from them, as praier is either vocall, or personall, & that whether we respect the natural gust, or supernaturall, this being also either principall or instrumentall, and therefore prayer & fasting haue no power at all.* For prooffe of the assumption we haue a long discourse of six or seauen leaues to no purpose, but onely to spend time, of the cause of miraculous operations, a thinge knowne to all, but entred into Diuinity, and I thanke the lord not doubted of by me. To let goe there fore all your needefesse talke, I answer breisly, that the power proceedinge from our praiers was personall, (if you take personall as you ought, and as learned men doe for an acceptation of our persons) not of my selfe onely, but of all his faithfull people then assembled together, accepted by god the father in the person of Iesus Christ. Secondly that this personall power was supernaturall, depending onely vpon god his institution, and promise made to praier,

not

not vpon any naturall efficacy whatſoeuer. Thirdly that this power was instrumentall, not principall. Fourthly that you moſt abſurdly conclude of the premiſſes. That becauſe this power is inſtrumentall, therefore it is not perſonal: which both may ſtand together, and doe in all the children of god. But if you will take perſonal according to a peculiar fancie or your owne brayne, for a primary being of this power in our perſons, then is your firſt diſtribution childiſh, not comprehending all the kindes of power, and ſo what ſoeuer is built therevpon not worth a riſh. But is not this a worthy argument thinke you, which would as well ouerthrow all efficacy of prayer whatſoeuer as that action at Nottingham? Surely you diſpute as if you were Atheiſts. For admit all power of prayer I hold be either vocall or perſonall, and that it is effectual by neither meanes, it muſt needes bee it ſhould haue no effect at all. O intolerable impietie

Like ſtuffe it is when you oppoſe the *power of God, and the meanes*, whereas both vſually concur in all actions. You goe on, and will diſproue, that *prayer and faſting is not a meanes of apprehending the ſupernatural power of God*. But ſpare your labour: who hath affirmed it? I know no meanes of apprehending either his power, or other his graces, but onely faith. If you can diſproue that this hand layeth not hold vpon the power of God, ſtrengthened by his promiſe, *what ſoeuer ye aſke the Father in my name, that he will giue vnto you*, proceede on I pray you. I thus then you ſay, *That this promiſe containeth not an absolute warrant for every extraordinary enterpriſe*: And herein I accord with you, I hat only thoſe things are aſked in the name of Chriſt, which are aſked according to the wil of God, for his ſonnes ſake. But it is according to his will, that in all vexations of Sathan wee ſhould call vpon him for helpe in the mediation of his ſonne. *Call vpon me*, ſaith he, *in the day of thy trouble, and I will beare thee*. *Pſal. 50, 16*. And our Sauour teacheth vs to pray, *But deliuer vs from euill*. Wherevpon, if it had pleaſed you, you might haue eaſily ſcene wee diſ nothing in this buſineſſe this way, but for which we haue apparant warrant from the word. Yea further, we haue the plaine words of Chriſt for confirmation, where he telleth vs, *That this kind goeth not forth but by prayer and faſting*. But becauſe theſe words are oft alleaged, and being truly vnderſtood, make much for this cauſe, I will open the meaning of them, as I now vpon more deliberation conceiue them. Something I differ from that which hitherto I haue followed, but I take it; this which I ſhall now remember, is moſt agreeable

page 188.

page 189. 1

Pſal. 50, 16,

page 191
Math. 17, 21.

Math. 10.

James 1. 6. 7.

agreeable to our Sauours meaning: And I wil neuer be ashamed to reforme my iudgment. where I see truth doth ouerway me. Thus then I doe interpret them. Whereas the Disciples demaunded why they could not caste forth that diuel, Our Sauour doth answer to this effect: Because (saith he) you are destitute of that faith & confidence which once you had, when I sent you forth to preach by two and by two, vnto the lost sheepe of the house of Israel. At that time I gaue you power ouer vncleane spirits to cast them out, and you proued the authority I gaue you not to be in vaine: but after that embassage was ended, as if your commission had expired with that charge, you now doubted, whether you might exercise the like power still or no. & whether I would be assistant vnto you in the like worke: by which waivering you could not receaue this thing at my handes, but deprived your selues of that confidence which you should haue had in this cause: which if it had remained firme and stable in you, though in quantity no more then a grayne of mustard seede, there should haue bene nothing vnpossible vnto you, & this deuill should haue gone forth at your first commaunde. This then was your first error. Secondly you failed in this, that whereas your extraordinary giift wanted, notwithstanding you set vpon this worke extraordinarily: whereas in this case, you should onely haue betaken your selues to the ordinary course, which is fasting and prayer: for this kinde of diuel wherewith the child is possessed goeth forth by no other meanes then the vsuall and common way of humbling your selues, and intreating the same with al earnestnes at the Lordes handes: vnderstandinge me of the ordinary meanes. This interpretation ariseth most properly out of the wordes without any violence: wherein the failing of faith in the disciples, is an viter defect of miraculous faith: the vse of fasting and prayer is not an helpe to weake miraculous faith, which now in the disciples was none at all, but the ordinary meanes where miraculous faith sayl eth.

These be the frivolous arguments, whereby you would disproue the efficacie of Gods ordinance for the casting forth of Satan by fasting and prayer as the meanes of waking & strengthening of faith, to which the Lord graunteth all behouefull requests to his children. Now followes the second parte, whether *Insistinge faith* doth effect that worke. To which I answer. It doth, if you meane. It effecteth by obteyning. For what shall we not receaue by Iustifying faith, so long as it craueth nothing: but that is warranted by the

THE 9. DIALOGVE.

67

by the worde? It is *our* faith that *ouercommeth* the world, yea by which we *ouercome* that wicked one, that is, the diuel. He that spared not his owne sonne but gave him for vs all, how shall he not with him giue vs all things also? Doth not our Sauiour ascribe many of his great workes he did, to the parties faith vpon whome they were dones? Be of good cheere *daughters*, (saith he) *thy faith hath saved thee*. And that we may know this faith receauing his great workes, was in some a iustifying faith, to some he saide before he did the worke, *Thy sinnes are forgiven thee*. Now what doe you object against this doctrine? The reas the words of our Sauiour *All things are possible to him that beleeueth*, make for confirmation thereof: you reply, *This faith was not the Exorcists faith, but of the parties possessed*. I answer, we know no such difference, as if some one or two were Exorcists amongst vs, & all the rest of the people of other condicion, but the whole congregation is of one office, and one faith in this businesse, we be all ioint Exorcists, as I may so say, and by way of obteyning throwers out of Sathan. A game you object, *That if iustifying faith hath this power, then it belongeth manifestly to all the elect of God, which I yealde you*. But then say you, *They which cannot effect this worke, may doubt of their iustification*. I answer, this objection sauiors of very gross ignorance. You should be able to teach others, that the Lord hath not tyed himselfe to one vniforme order in bestowing of corporall blessings, as if all his children should obtaine all at all times. He hath not definitiue set downe in his worde, what, and when he wil giue vs in this kinde, but hath onely promised them vpon this condicion, So far as the good of his children, and his owne glorye shall require. Therefore though he graunt these outward things to some, and deny them being requested to other some, this difference is no cause we should stagger in our iustification. Besides say you, *If iustifying faith were of this force, it would haue bene mentioed in such places where the effects of faith are purposely registred*. Proue that all the effects of iustifying faith are there mentioned particularly & by name, else you trifle. Albeit S. James saith, *If we resist the diuell he shall fly* noting generally our victory against him, not onely in his assaults, but also in his possessions. Expelling of diuels mentioned in S. Marke, belonged to a miraculous faith which was peculiarly giuen to some of the Christians of that age, such as were hearers of the Ap. stles, and beleeuers by their preaching: as heeretofore I haue shewed more then once. And therefore you might haue saved that labour in vsing so many wordes, & citing so many testinonies

1 John 5:4 &
2:14.
Rom. 8:32.

Math. 9:29

Math. 9:22

Marke 9:23
Page 294.

pag. 295

James 4, 7,
pag. 296 &c.
Mat 16:17. 18

Doctrine
pag. 73
Detection in
the epistle.

to proue the Sunne shines in a cleare heauen at mid-day:

A Survey of the Tenth Dialogue.

The tenth Dialogue treateth of *Miracles*, and laboreth to ouerthrow *dispossession of diuels in these times*, because such *dispossession* is a *miracle*, & *miracles* be expued long since. In prosecuting of which argument, it is strange to see how the *Discomers* beate themselves with their owne rod. They would proue vnto vs that *miracles* are ceased, & yet afford vs no small *miracle* in their owne persons. For is it not wonderfull, that men thinking themselves to haue some sharpnesse of wit, to be furnished with sufficient copy of wordes, to haue perused many bookes, and to haue gathered great variety of learning, after some long time spent in denberation and conference, and then aduersely committing to writing what they had coceaued, Should notwithstanding all this, like men skarred out of their wits, and vtterly bereft of all power of discerning, take shadows for bodies, bushes for men, chaike for cheefe, and grope in the sun light, as in the darknesse. They haue shewed incredible blindenes in their former discourses, but in this booke of *Miracles*, it is Miraculous to behould the palpable errors they runne into. It may be they did of purpose herein obserue a decorum, that the strange handling of the matter, might be suitable to the title. But that I doe not seeme to charge them wrongfully, I will betake my selfe to the Survey, first for more plainesse setting downe the truth in this poynt, and after rise vp their pedlers pack of deuices

*definition of a
true miracle*

A true miracle therefore breifly may be defined thus, That it is an hard and vn-usuall worke, surpassing all faculty of created nature, done by the diuine power to that ende, to inuincible the behoulders with admiration, and confirme their faith in the word of God. These true Miracles be of two sortes, for eyther they be wrought by the Lorde himselfe without any apparant meanes to vs, or else are effected by the ministry of man. Of the former kinde was the bush that burned, and consumed not in the sight of Moses: the pyllar of a cloude by day, and the pyllar of fire by night conducting the children of Israel out of *Aegypt*: the slaughter in *Senacheribs* host of an hundred fourscore and fise thousand in one night: the star that directed the wise men out of the East, to the place of our Saviours birth, & such like. Concerning miracles of this nature, if one shall demaund whether they be ceased or no, it is to be answered, they are not. For the

Lorde

Exod. 3. 2.

Exod. 13. 21.

2 Kings 19.

35.

Math. 2. 2.

Lorde hath referued this liberty to himfelfe, by extraordinary power to reueale his iudgments to the world, when and where it fhall feeme beft vnto him. And therefore our Sauour fpeakinge of his comming faith, *There fhall be fignes in the funne, & in the Moone, and in the floues, & the power of heauen fhall be shaken.* Shall we think thefe are no miracles? or that they be paff, and not to come? Experience alfo confirmithe faine. It were infinite to gather what hath happened in all ages fince the publifhing of the Gofpell. I wil remember onely one or two for example in our owne times. Was it not the admiration of all Chriftendome to behould that bright and cleare new ftar which appeared in the yere 1572, continuing almoft fix monethes? But to come to our owne home, was it not a greate miracle that at a place called *Kynnaftone* neere *Marclech* hil in the county of *Hertford* certaine rookes with a peece of ground of twenty fixe acres, removed and went forward the fpace of foure daies, removing forty paces in twelue houres, & carrying great trees & fheep coates, fome with threefcore fheepe in them, ouerthrowing *Kennaftone* chappel, altering two high waies nigh an hundred yardes, and where tillage ground was, leauing paffure, and where paffure, there tillage? yet all this was feene amongst vs the 17. of Feb. in the yere 1571. Therefore to fpeake in confufed tearmes that miracles are ceafed without diftinction of their nature, is the parte of ignorant men, and of fuch as neither would finde out the truth, nor teach it: but only deceaue thefelues & other with general words.

That fecond fort of miracles, which is done by the miniftery of men, are all of them wrought by a miraculous faith, apprehending the extraordinary reuealed will of God concerning fome ftrange worke, what, when & how it is to be performed. All which *Peter Martyr* diftinguifheth by their *natures*, by their *effeets*, and by the *fpéciall manner how they are done*. By their *natures*, for that fome of them are admirable for the very thing done, being fo ftrange and great as the like is not to be found in all nature. Such was the ftaying of the Sunne in the time of *Iofua*, and the turning back of the fhadow to confirme *Ezekiah*, and fuch others. Some are not maruelous for the greatneffe of the thing done, but for the manner vfed in doing; as was the cloud and rayne of *Elyas*, the thundering of *Samuell*, and of the like fort. For fuch things are done naturally, but at that time were miracles in regard of the manner by which they were effected, that is, not by naturall caufes but at the commaund and wil of the Saints. In refpect of the *effeets*, fome onely

caufe

ground removed

loc com, claf
1 cap. 8, sect.
42

caule admiration and feare, as the burning lampes and thunders in mount Sinai &c. some haue a deeper impression, partly for benefit, as the sick that were healed by Christ and his Apostles, partly in punishment, as when *Annanias* and *Saphyra* were strooke dead at the wordes of *Peter*. In regarde of speciall manner of workinge, some were done by praier, as the dead childe restored to liue by *Elisba*: Some by commaund, as *Peter* bid the lame man in the name of Ie. us Christ arise and walk. Some neither by prayer, nor commaund, but of their owne accorde, the saints themselues occupied in som other matter, as when the shadow of *Peter* as he walked by did heale the sick: and the kercheits & handkercheits carried from *S. Paul* his body. All these done by the ministry of men are now ceased, for that the miraculous faith by which they were done neither is at this present, nor hath bene these many ages imparted to any. I hus then we see what a true miracle is, what be the diuers kindes, and which be remainyng in the Church and shall continew to the ende of the world: & which at this time are ceased.

Now to come to the other poynt: whether casting forth of diuels in these times by fasting & prayer be a miracle or no. To this I answer, it is not. *Christ* some saith, that Miracles were not done in his time. And *Augustine* affirmeth, That Miracles were not permitted to continew to his daies, lest the minde should alwayes looke after visible things, and mankinde should grow cold through the custome of these matters: by the nouelty whercof in former time they did burne. But what neede I cite authors for this, when as your selues mainteyne stronglie that Miracles ceased together with the Apostles? Wel then let vs to yne heerevnto, That casting forth of diuels by fasting & prayer were used in the times of *Christ* & *Augustine*, as we haue shewed before by their owne wordes, which haue taught vs that their power were brought to the publique assemblies, & deliuered by the prayers of the congregation. Wherevpon it must needs follow, that this manner of deliuerance in *Christ*'s and *Augustine*'s iudgments, & so of the Church in their time, was no miracle. And the reason of this may be apparant by that description of miracles already set down. First because dispossellion of diuels was very frequent & common in their daies. But things common are no miracles. For a Miracle saith *Augustine*, is an vnwonted thing: And therefore (saith he) they are not done in these daies. Because they wolde not moue, except they were maruelous, neither woulde they be maruelous, if they were vsuall. Secondly, for that the worke it selfe doth not make a miracle in respect of mans

Chrysost: in e
pist. 1. ad cor.
cap. 1. hom. 6
Aug. de ver.
telig cap. 25

August de v-
tilitate cred.
ad Honorat.
cap. 16

of mans ministry, but the manner of doing, as hath bene shewed in the second distinction of Miracles. As for example, The cloud and the rayne sent at *Elyas* prayer was a miracle, because the Lord had reuealed it vnto him, and he had embraced the same by faith knowing when and how it should be sent. Yet when the Church of God in the time of drought and famyne, shall by publique praier obtaine cloudes & rayne, this is no miracle. As when *Salomon* saith, when be a men shall be *but vp*, and there shall be no rayne, because they haue sinned against thee, and shall pray in this place, and confesse thy name, & turne from their sinne, when thou dost afflict them, Then beare thou in heauen, and giue raine vpon the earth &c. Doth he here pray they might be releued by miracle? Nay, but sheweth what the ordinary course of the Church is in this case. So when the Disciples cast forth diuels by their myraculous faith, and the Church now daies by fasting & prayer, the same worke in substance is done by both, but the manner of doing is much differing, which makes a difference also in the Action, and causeth that their worke was miraculous, & the same done by the Church in these times not to be miraculous. This little may suffice for distinct vnderstanding of this doctrine: which diligently obserued will preferue vs from those horrible down-falls into which these blinde *Discourfers* tumble themselves. Now then to examine theirs.

First we haue a definition of a *Miracle* in generall, to be an extraordinary worke of God, highly surmounting the whole faculty of euery created nature, to worke admiration in the beholders, and to confirme their faith in the truth of Gods word. Next we haue it deuided into the seuerall kinde, whereof the one is a True miracle, the other a false. From whence it must needs follow that the generall definitiō must also agree to a false miracle. And that therefore a false miracle is an extraordinary worke of God, highly surmounting the whole faculty of euery created nature, to confirme the faith of the beholders in the truth of the worde. But this is a thing most absurd once to dreame of. Seing then to make a Generall whose definition can not agree to the Specialls, is a worke aboue nature: and that *M. Deacon* & *M. Walker* haue created such a Generall, I doe demonstratiuely therevpon conclude, That miracles are not yet ceased.

Againe, whereas I asirme, That casting forth of diuels in these times by fasting & prayer is no miracle: because it is done by ordinary meanes without the miraculous faith, (in which sence onely I vnderstand meanes, the vse whereof maketh a worke to be no mira-

page, 311.

cle) you keepe a foolish iangling about this, in three pages together without either head or foote. Onely when in one place you began to conclude, according to your absurd manner you oppose the supernatural power of God, to his appointed meanes, as if ther were deadlie feude betwene them, so that they must needes kill and destroy one, an other. May it not be said, that *Moses* by his miraculous faith & his rod deuided the sea, as by the meanes, because the Lord in truth wrought the thinge by his owne mighty arme?

pag. 312: &c.

Moreouer to stop your brawling mouthes you haue beene tould, that *Casting forth of diuils in this sort, is a thing marueylous, but not miraculous.* Which difference, if you were not miraculously depriued of common sence, you might easily perceauce to be no lesse then is betwene the Generall & the Speciall. Every Miraculous thing is marueylous, but not euery Marueylous thing miraculous. Except it was a miracle that *Ioseph* placed his brethren according to their auntyentie, because the *Egyptians* marueiled at it. *Cato* marueyled that one wysard, when he saw an other, could forbeare laughing. was this forbearance of laughing in the wysardes a miracle? If this might passe for current, we should haue as many miracles as we haue fooles, and so the world full of miracles. But you will proue it by Hebrew that *Marueyles & Miracles are all one*, because *Oth & Mopheth* are the same. But first you should haue proued that all marueyles are eyther *Oth* or *Mopheth*: which you neuer goe about: and it were but lost labour you should. So then the whole discourse for nine pages together, is an euident reasoning from the affirmation of the Generall, to the Speciall: as if one shoulde say thus, That which is a liuing creature is *M. Deacon & M. Walker*: But an Oxe is a liuing creature, and diuers others his coosen germanes besides: Therefore an Oxe by this Logike should be as wise as your selues. Surely you haue found the Philosophers stone which is able to turne leade into gould: you can doe more then the spirits can: for you haue proued and I also beleue it, they cannot transforme one nature into an other, which I see is within the compasse of your Omnipotency.

pag: 321. &c

You returne a fresh to *Miracles wrought by meanes*. Concerning which I tell you againe (for such importunate beggars wil not rest with one answer) that whatsoever is wrought by ordinary meanes onely, without miraculous faith, is no miracle. Now if you can shew that *Moses, Elijah, Elshba, Peter* and the rest wrought their admirable workes in such manner, then I will esteeme you for great wise men

wife men. You affirme that *Dispossession of diuels were alwaies reputed true miracles in the Church of God*; which I haue manifested to be false by the testimonies of *Chrysostome & Augustine*. whereas you are pressed by *Exorcistes* that *If signes & wonders be true miracles indeede, then Anti-christ must also needes worke true miracles*, to shift of this (which you can neuer auoyd) you distinguish clarkly of that which is not in the syllogisme, to wit of Miracles in generall. The syllogisme mentioneth onely true Miracles, & therefore your distinction must needes be, That true miracles are of two sorts, either true or false, (which is your former miraculous diuision) or else you leaue the matter where it was, yelding that Anti-christ doth worke true miracles. But forsooth you will goe strictly to worke, and after some nipping disunctiues, at last you discend to this, that *If I wrought a wonder at Maheniston, then I wrought an vndoubted true miracle*. must you needes still inferre a Speciall from the affirmation of the Generall? You abound in such admirable conclusions. Where you say, that *Expelling of Spirits, is no lesse maruelous now, then it was in the primitive Church*. If you meane the Church in the Apostles time, you say vntuly: It was done by miraculous faith then, it is not so now, which makes a difference in the worke, as hath bene shewed in *Elyah* his cloude, and that which is ordinarily obteyned by prayer. And this is all you can say to proue that *Expelling of diuels is now a miracle*: for which you haue not afforded the least colour of any reason.

The rest of this Dialogue is spent in prouing that *Miracles are ceased*, wherein I might be silent, both considering *Dispossession* in these times is no miracle, and therefore nothinge at all impeached by this discourse, and also for that I graunt the ceasinge of miracles according to such distinction; as hath bene before sett downe, that is, as they be wrought by the ministry of man. Neither doth any thing you bring weaken this truth, but rather much confirme it. Yet in handling this poynt you haue diuers vnsounde positions. As if there were no other ende of miracles, but the *testification of Christ his Deity, & the confirmation of the Gospell*, whereas Miracles doe as well confirme the Law, as the Gospell, Iudgment, as well as Mercy. And the Lord alwaies hath & will testify his wrath from heauen against sinners, which will not beleue the threatnings of his word to forsake their wicked waies. Againe, say you, *Christis resurrection was the last Miracle for confirmation of his Deity*. Then what was his Ascencion into heauen? Is it nothing with ycus? It being

ing also confirmed that in these daies of *Asbuesme* the Lord may and
doth reveale his extraordinary power, for the scivifyinge of mens stony
 hearts. You answer *It is an irreligious insinuation, & a gap for all kna-*
ueries, but if you were able to weigh all things aright, you woulde
 see it were irreligious to sew pillowes vnder mens elbowes. And as
 for the gap to *knauery*, what window can be opened, when the mini-
 stery of man is wholly excluded, & these wondrous workes left im-
 mediately to the Lord himselfe? you are mad when you see not the
 difference betwene the Papists dealing in this businesse, and that of
 the Church of God. *D. Fulke* doth worthely reprove *their lying mi-*
racles, but bring forth one word out of him, wherein he giues the
 least check to this manner of work done by God his faithful people:
 against which you haue no lesse ignorantly, then proudly vaunted
 your selues like two mighty Goliaths. As for those Learned men
 which you challenge to mainteine this cause against you, would
 you haue them to strayn themselves with such triflers? It is inough
 for them to leaue such as my selfe, vnworthy to carry their bookes,
 to lash such bayards. All your reasons against Miracles conclude on
 ly against such as are done by the ministry of man: and so likewise
 your testimonies vnto which I willingly subscribe. Onely, good Rea-
 der, marke that *D. Fulke* (who is the fourteenth in order) speaking
 against an ordinary function in the Church to cast forth diuels, mea-
 eth a peculyar office of Exorcists, as it is in the popish Church, ap-
 pointed to this purpose. There is no such office left by Christ:
 but that a faithfull congregation making suite to the Lord in theme-
 diation of his Sonne, hath no promise to obtaine the deliuerance
 of their brethren from the vexation of diuels, it neuer came into
 his heart (for any thing I could euer see by his writings) to thinke.
 But these men according to their manner, alleadg one thing for an
 other: euery clod in the fallow, is an hare with them, and they can
 follow it with as full cry, as if the best game that is were on foote be
 fore them. Well now, Christian Reader, that I haue layd open ther
 dealing vnto thee, be thou thy selfe Iudge, whether in the begining
 my speach exceeded any thing or no. I doubt not, but thou thy self
 wilt be amased to see men so bereft of all iudgment: and that thou
 wilt behould in them a manifest example of that bewitching, where-
 with *S. Paule* did charge the foolish *Galathians*. I hope also thou wilt
 rather be a meanes to free these men from the snares, where-with
 thou seest them intrangled, then suffer thy selfe to be intrapped with
 them. And therefore relying vpon thy Christian wisdom in this
 bechalse

pag. 327.

page. 329.

pag. 330. &c.

pag. 333

Gal. 3. 1.

behalf, I proceede to the last Dialogue.

A Surrey of the Eleventh Dialogue.

The first part of this Dialogue is the linke of all the former, being nothing else but a *Recapitulation* of them: we haue proued the feuerall channels vnfauiory ynough: I meane not heere to styre the afresh. The second part is a *Patheticall persuasion*: *Patheticall* indeede both to him that would reioyce at the infirmity of others, for it would make him to laugh: and also to him that greeveth at their harmes, for it would make him to pittie you. *It is no discredit, you Discowfers, that I am afraid of, No scandall to zealous professors, No suspicion of Conspira- y, No confirmation of the B. nor any other such sōd respects, that caugeth me to be stiff in opinion.* I hope the Lord will assist me (it is my prayer that he will) that I shall treade all these vnder my feete, and greater matters then these if neede be, for his truthe sake. But if any can disproue the actions that haue bene done for matter of fact, or any thing that I haue deliuered or taught, by sound doctrine out of the truth of God his worde, I will giue glorie to the Lord, & confesse my self to haue erred and bene deceaued, al though for deceauing, the God of heauen & earth is witnes it neuer came into my harte. *As for losse of maintenance, & deprivation from Ecclesiasticall dignity,* neyther doe these moue me one whit. This is your silly cunning vnder pretence of alleadging for me, to write your owne Apologie. You comfort your selues with a Discourse, *That no man is able to make a flat nullitie in any mans ministry.* Deceau not your selues *M. Deacon & M. Walker*: The Church may deprive of their ministry such as by erroneous crimes deserue it. May not the Church make a Minister that hath greuously offended the congregation, & continueth obstinate, as one that is a *Publicane & an heathen*? Doe you thinke an Heathen may houlde the place of a Minister ouer the Church of God? Again, such as making shipwrack of a good conscience are deliuered to Sathan, can they during their subiection be fit capitaines against him, to the people of God? *The salt that hath lost his savor, with what shall it be seasoned? It is good for nothing, but to be cast forth, & to be trodden vnder foote by men.* How shall he reprove others, that is reprooued by all? How shall he which teacheth not himselfe, teach an other? How shall the knowne Adulterer commaund others not to commit Adultery? *Let a Bishop be blameable,* saith the Apostle: which charge hath,

page: 339

page: 347

page 349-350

Math. 18. 17

Tim. 1. 20

Math. 5. 15

Rom. 2. 1-23

Tim. 3. 2

Psal. 50, 16

p. 140

1 King: 22, 34
Mica, 1, 6

Zachar. 1, 17

Psal. 50, 11

not onely place in his first Election, but also the whole time he con-
tynueth in his office. *Vnto the wicked (saith God) what hast thou to do
to declare mine ordinances, that thou shouldst take my covenant into
thy mouth, Seeing thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast my wordes be-
hinde thee? For when thou seest a theefe thou runnest with him, and thou
art partaker with the Adulterers.* Therefore this consolation of yours
will deceaue you. But you say, *where God doth continue his gracious
gifts in any, there ought to be also continued the execution of the gifts.*
This also is a rotten foundation. I doubt not but the fallie Apollies
retayned still their gift of speech, wherein they seemed to surpasse
S. Paul. Beelides a man may fallie iudge of his owne gifts. *When
went the Spirit of the Lord from mee, to speake vnto thee, said Zedekiah
vnto Nubaiab?* Indeede the Lord doth threaten that night shalbe to
falle prophets for a vision, and darknes for a diuination: that the Sunne
shall go downe ouer them, & that the day shalbe darke. And I beseech
you weigh but with indifferency (if it be possible in your own case)
if in these discourses, *The sword of the Lord hath not bene vpon your
right eye.* All these things considered, stand not (I beseech you) in
defence of error and wickednes. Regard I haue stricken you, ra-
ther vpon the garments, then vpon the bare skin. Indignation som-
times hath wrung from me sharpe speech, yet such as hath wound-
ed no further, then for Schoole matters, except your selues will.
Receauue therefore the word of exhortation. Let your defence be
confession: your reply, teares: your inueighing against others, I haue
sinned: your suite for preferment, to be in the number of Gods ch-
ildren. VVhat if the Church sleepe in doing her duty? *He that kee-
peth Isr aell neither slumbereth, nor sleepesth.* VVhat if the Lord also for
a time keepe silence? Indeede, saith he, *I held my tongue: & thou sh-
ouldst I was like thee: but I will reprove thee, & set thy li nes in order
before thee.* It is a fearfull thing to fall into the hands of God. *Who
shall pleade for vs, when all shall stand at the same barre with vs?*
The Lord graunt my wordes may haue due place with you, that in
steade of prouing me a counterfeyt (which your discourses inten:)
you may gaine your selues true Christians, whereby your losse in
fayling of your purpose may turne to your aduantage, & my grieve
in sustayning so many reproches, may in the ende yeild me & all the
angels of God, great matter of ioy.

In the meane season, I humbly thanke the Lord which yet at
last hath opened your mouthes to acknowledge the truth in some
parte. For proceedinge in your course, and coming to speake of a
precompact.

precompacted confederacy, towards the ende you give eident testimony of mine innocency, affirming that *Howsoever others esteeme* Page 151.
of any comp. act, for your owne partes (You assure mee) you are very far
from such a suspicion, yea & this also you dare say for so many besides, as
haue bene acquainted with my former sincerity, and wright carriage,
they are euery of them free from such a perswasion. And this onely, say
you, is that which we entertaine, & very confidently bould for a truth,
Namely that the graciefull boy, did gracelesly counterfeyt, & knowingly
boare the world in hand, he was really possessed of Satban, when there
was no such matter at all. But as concerning your selfe, we doe vndoubt-
edly thinke, that the same was simply your error in iudgment, but no
purposed error in your practise at all. This is your testimony. Seeing
therefore you are so perswaded of me in your consciences, how coes
it to passe, that through your whole discourses you haue traduced
me as a deceauer? And namely in your Answer, pag: 39. 40.
where speaking of Somers his supernaturall knowledg, you shitt that
of, by ascribing his predictions &c: to some cunning confederacyes w th
me. Why should we wonder at all (say you) that two cunning company-
ons confederate together before should conclude such a course betwene the
selues, as the one (by the helpe of the other) should prognosticate such stra-
nge & incredible events, &c. Haue you there striuen against consci-
ences? Or hath the truth heere preuayled against your willes? Sure-
ly it is wonderfull that men seeking fauour by soothing, and hoping
for some great aduantage by iustifying other mens indirect courses,
should notwithstanding the B. his violent dealing, whether by im-
prisonment, or by pretence of law whatsoeuer, notwithstanding also
to M. Harperts authentick booke, written for confirmation of the
sayd proceedings, yea notwithstanding their owne enties, and long
 tedious paynes to compasse them, should I say, notwithstanding all
these, after many discourses cleare me altogether of the pretended crime
and thereby withall shew that the Bishop hath dealt vniustly, M. Har-
per falsly, and they themselues wickedly in ioyning hands to oppr-
esse the guiltlesse. It is the Lord which catcheth the wise in their owne crea-
teynesse. Neither doe I onely in this your confession behold the victo-
ry of truth ouer yourselues, but am forced to prauise the Lord
for his great goodnesse, which hath made the BISHOPPE him-
selfe (the greatest Aduersary to this cause) to subscribe to my vp-
rightnesse in it. Your booke comes forth by his priuiledge. No
doubt it was perused, & perused againe. It lay a long time in his
handes. And who can tell whether this testimony be not his owne
wordes.

wordes set downe vnder your name: It may be the Lord hath touched his heart for that he did against me. And howbeit publique confession were requisite in publique wrongs, yet it is some ease to see mens consciences to make confession covertly, whatsoeuer therefore other men may thinke, I hat he would be farre from such acknowledgment, yet I will hope the best, as knowing there is nothing vnpossible vnto the Lord. Neyther skills it greatly whether he writt these very wordes or no, considering he hath allowed & approued them at least, in giuing them publique passage and priuiledg to the. And therefore though *S. Paul*, when the seruants were sent vnto him, refused to depart secretly out of prison, but as by publique authority he was cast in, so by the same authority he would be brought forth: yet I being beyond comparision inferior to him, will rest my selfe content in hauing my open iniuries satisfied, though but in this secret manner. How good and gracious is the Lord which bringeth forth the righteoutnesse of his seruants as the light, & their iudgment as the noone day. As he dealt with our heade Christ in causing *Pilat* to pronounce him a iust man, so he dealeth with his poore members accordinge to their severall degrees. Hee made *Saul* acknowledg *Dauid* more righteous then him selfe, & *Agrippa* & *Festus* to say of *Paule*, He had done nothing worthy of bonds. To this therefore onely wise, & gracious, & Mighty Lord God, the father, the Sonne, & the holy spirit, be all honor & praise for ever & euer.

Amen,

FINIS.

